

DUMBARTON OAKS STUDIES

“ IV ”

THE IDEA OF
APOSTOLICITY
IN BYZANTIUM

AND THE LEGEND OF THE
APOSTLE ANDREW

THE IDEA OF
APOSTOLICITY
IN BYZANTIUM

AND THE LEGEND OF THE
APOSTLE ANDREW

by

FRANCIS DVORNIK

*Professor of Byzantine History, Dumbarton Oaks,
and Member of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences,
Harvard University*



HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, Massachusetts

1958

ANAL

DF 503

OS

V. 14

1914

Sept 1914

*All Rights reserved by the
Trustees for Harvard University
The Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection
Washington, D.C.*

1914

PRINTED IN GERMANY AT J.J. AUGUSTIN, GLÜCKSTADT

Foreword

The tradition concerning the missionary activity of the Apostle Andrew in Achaëa and his death at Patras is regarded as legendary by the majority of modern scholars. The account of the Apostle's residence at Byzantium, where he is said to have ordained his disciple Stachys as the first bishop of that city, has likewise been shown to have little foundation in fact. But even if they are fictitious, these traditions played an important role in the religious history of the Middle Ages. The purpose of this study is not, therefore, to re-examine the apocryphal literature in which these traditions are contained with a view to ascertaining the true facts about the Apostle Andrew (which, in all probability, will never be fully known), but to determine when these traditions arose, what use was made of them, and what prompted the Byzantines to regard the Apostle Andrew as the founder of their Church.

These problems are intimately connected with a larger issue, namely, the importance attached, both in the West and in the East, to the apostolic origin of a bishopric. Thus we are led to examine the role which the idea of apostolicity played in the relations between Rome and Byzantium, and more specifically the use made in Greek polemical literature of the supposed apostolic origin of the bishopric of Constantinople.

These questions, in turn, cannot be answered without reference to the over-all development of Church organization in the Later Roman Empire. It is now generally admitted that accommodation to the administrative division of the Empire was a guiding principle in the structure of the Early Church. Yet it remains to be determined to what extent this principle continued to dominate the outlook of the Eastern Church, and how it clashed with the idea of apostolicity which was adopted by Western Christianity at a relatively early period.

Such are the main topics presented in this Study, and it is hoped that their discussion may contribute to a better understanding of Byzantine history and of Eastern Christianity.

FOREWORD

I should like to express my sincere thanks to my colleagues at Dumbarton Oaks with whom I have had frequent occasion to discuss the problems raised by this study and who have given me their help in my research. I should also like to thank members of the staff of Dumbarton Oaks for their assistance in preparing my manuscript for the press, and for reading the proof.

It is a matter of great regret to me that Professor A. M. Friend, Jr. did not live to see this work completed. As Director of Studies at Dumbarton Oaks he first invited me to investigate the transfer of the relics of the Apostle Andrew to the church of the Holy Apostles at Constantinople, and encouraged me to extend my research to the various problems connected with the legendary tradition of Andrew. It is on his initiative that this work was undertaken, and I wish to offer it in reverent respect of his memory.

Dumbarton Oaks
Washington, D. C.
June, 1958

FRANCIS DVORNIK

CONTENTS

Foreword		v
----------	--	---

I	The Guiding Principle in the Evolution of Church Organization	3
---	---	---

The practice of the Apostles — The Council of Nicaea sanctions the adaptation of the ecclesiastical organization to the administrative division of the Empire — The bishop of Alexandria as supra-metropolitan? — Position of Antioch — The rights of the bishops of Antioch compared with those of Rome and Alexandria — Ephesus, Caesarea, Heraclea as supra-metropolitan cities? — The canons of the Council of Constantinople (381) compared with the Nicene decrees — The see of Jerusalem — Jerome's testimony — Adaptation to the divisions of the Empire in the West: Rome, Italy, Illyricum — Africa and Spain — Gaul and Arles.

II	The Idea of Apostolicity in the West and in the East before the Council of Chalcedon	39
----	--	----

Rome the only apostolic see in the West — Apostolic sees in the East — Canon three of the Council of Constantinople (381) viewed in a new light — Reaction in the West — The views of the Council of 382 on apostolicity — St. Basil and the idea of apostolicity — John Chrysostom — Struggle between Alexandria and Constantinople — The principle of apostolicity at the Council of Ephesus — St. Cyril, Dioscorus of Alexandria, and Domnus of Antioch — Leo I's success in stressing the apostolicity of his see in the East — The idea of apostolicity at Chalcedon — Leo I and the so-called twenty-eighth canon — Attitude of the legates — Omission of apostolicity in the canon — Reasons for Leo's negative attitude — Leo's apparent success a disguised compromise.

CONTENTS

III Growth of the Idea of Apostolicity during the Acacian Schism 106

Acacius and Pope Simplicius — Gelasius' claims derived from Petrine tradition — Eastern and western reaction to Gelasius' claims — Increasing concern with apostolicity in the East — Libellus Hormisdæ — Apostolic character of the Roman see in imperial and patriarchal letters — Currency of the idea of apostolicity in the East and its possible consequences for Constantinople.

IV The Birth of the Andrew Tradition Concerning Byzantium 138

The transfer of Andrew's relics and its meaning — No trace of the Andrew tradition in Chrysostom's writings — St. Gregory of Nazianzus, Cyril of Jerusalem, Theodoret and Basil of Seleucia on Andrew — Western writers on Andrew — The Andrew Legend unknown in the sixth century — The see of Constantinople called "apostolic" from the seventh century onward — This usage not originated by Andrew Legend — The defenders of image-worship promote the idea of apostolicity in Constantinople — The Narratio key to the dating of writings containing the Andrew and Stachys Legend? — First codification of the Andrew Legend in Pseudo-Epiphanius' List of Disciples — Origin of List of Apostles and Disciples; dating of Pseudo-Epiphanius' List — Pseudo-Dorotheus' List later than Pseudo-Epiphanius' List and the Narratio.

V The Legendary Elements in the Andrew Tra- dition 181

The lost apocryphal Acts of Andrew as the ultimate source of the Constantinopolitan tradition — Gregory of Tours on Andrew's stay in Byzantium — The apocryphal Acts of Andrew known in the East and West from the fifth to the

CONTENTS

ninth centuries — Date of the composition of the apocryphal Acts of Andrew — Scythia, not Achaea, as Andrew's missionary field — Did Andrew preach in Asia Minor? — The legend of the maneaters as a reflection of the old tradition of Andrew's preaching in Scythia — Later tradition identifying the city of the maneaters with Sinope — The "Scythian tradition" reflected in the original Acts and in the Legends of Andrew's preaching in Colchis and in Georgia — Legendary traits in the "Achaean tradition" — Oldest traditions quote Luke as missionary of Achaea — Spread of the new "Achaean tradition" — Legendary accounts of Argyropolis and Zeuxippus — Probable origin of the "Achaean tradition" — Conclusion.

VI The Growth of the Andrew Legend 223

Ninth-century writings propagating the Andrew and Stachys Legend — The Laudatio, the Passio Artemii, and their connection with the Andrew Legend — The Laudatio echoes some ideas of the Patriarch Photius — Nicetas the Paphlagonian and Ignatius the Deacon on Andrew and Stachys — Theophanes' critical attitude toward the Andrew Legend — Another source of Byzantium's apostolic character: Constantinople heir of Ephesus and of the Apostle John. Ignatius' and Photius' testimony — John's connection with Constantinople in Armenian and Nestorian tradition — The Patriarch Photius and the Andrew Legend — The Andrew tradition, one of the principal arguments in the opusculum against Roman primacy, falsely attributed to Photius — The ninth-century Typicon of Constantinople on Andrew, Stachys, and Metrophanes — Spread of the Andrew and Stachys Legend in the tenth century — Its acceptance by the Syrians and Georgians — The Andrew story in the Russian Primary Chronicle — Pseudo-Symeon's and Cedrenus' catalogue of Byzantine bishops.

CONTENTS

VII The Idea of Apostolicity and the Andrew Legend in the Controversies between Con- stantinople and Rome 265

The idea of apostolicity as the basis of the pentarchic order — The pentarchic idea at the Ignatian Council of 869–870 — The definition of the duties of emperors and patriarchs in the Epanagoge reflects a new spirit created by the growth of apostolicity — Possibilities of a rapprochement on this new basis — The argument of apostolicity in the controversies of the tenth and eleventh centuries — The position of the see of Constantinople in Church organization and the Western canonists of the eleventh century — Eastern writers of the eleventh and twelfth centuries — The Andrew Legend and the controversies during the thirteenth century — How the character of universal teachers attributed to the apostles by Greek polemicists diminished the value of the Andrew tradition for the Greeks — The Andrew Legend in the fourteenth century in Byzantium — The Councils of Lyons and Florence on the see of Constantinople — Acceptance of the Andrew Legend by the Latin West.

List of Abbreviations	300
List of Manuscripts Quoted	301
Bibliography:	303
Primary Sources	303
Secondary Authorities	313
Index	329

**THE IDEA OF APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM
AND THE LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW**

CHAPTER ONE

THE GUIDING PRINCIPLE IN THE EVOLUTION OF CHURCH ORGANIZATION

The practice of the Apostles — The Council of Nicaea sanctions the adaptation of the ecclesiastical organization to the administrative division of the Empire — The bishop of Alexandria as supra-metropolitan? — Position of Antioch — The rights of the bishops of Antioch compared with those of Rome and Alexandria — Ephesus, Caesarea, Heraclea as supra-metropolitan cities? — The canons of the Council of Constantinople (381) compared with the Nicene decrees — The see of Jerusalem — Jerome's testimony — Adaptation to the divisions of the Empire in the West: Rome, Italy, Illyricum — Africa and Spain — Gaul and Arles.

The claims of the Roman bishops to primacy in the Church were based on the fact that they were successors of St. Peter, to whom Christ had entrusted the care of his Church. It is widely believed that, to counter these claims, the Byzantines invented a tradition of the apostolic foundation of the see of Byzantium by St. Andrew, the brother of St. Peter. Because Andrew was the first apostle to whom the Lord had addressed his invitation to become his disciple (John 1:37-42), and because Andrew had introduced his brother to Christ, the Byzantines are said to have believed themselves entitled to regard their episcopal see as equal, if not superior, to that of Rome. The fact that St. Andrew's relics had found their last resting place in the church of the Holy Apostles in Byzantium served to strengthen this belief, which is claimed to have become firmly embedded in the minds of the Byzantines, and to have been regarded by them for centuries as a truth inferior only to a dogmatic definition. This conviction is thought to have greatly influenced the religious evolution of Byzantium, and to have sharply accentuated the antagonism between Old and New Rome.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

In spite of its importance for the history of the relations between the Eastern and Western Churches, the question of the apostolic foundation of Byzantium has not yet been examined in all its complexities. It can be adequately treated only when studied in a broader context, and when the place of the general idea of apostolicity in Byzantium at different periods of its history has been determined.

First, in undertaking this study, the predominant position of the emperor in early Christian political philosophy must be borne in mind. The cardinal principle that the emperor was the representative of God on earth was rooted in Hellenistic political philosophy, and was accepted and adapted by Christian thinkers after the conversion of Constantine the Great. It was natural, especially in the East where Hellenism was very strong, that this principle should, for a long time, render the idea of apostolicity in Church organization relatively quiescent.

Second, the basis of the original organization of the Church before and after the Christianization of the Roman Empire must be considered. Here it must be stressed that the early Church found a model for its organization in the political organization of the Roman Empire rather than in the apostolic tradition.

There is no anomaly, no misconception or disparagement of the principle of apostolic tradition in this statement. On the contrary, this form of Church organization was initiated by the apostles themselves, who, for practical reasons, had to respect and to use the organization they found in the world in which they lived. They started their preaching in capitals or major cities of Roman provinces because there they found important Jewish communities, and from these centers Christianity spread through the provinces.

The apostles foreshadowed the intimate connection between the future organization of the Church and the administrative division of the Empire when they addressed their letters to the Christian communities of Roman provinces.¹ Peter wrote to the

¹ For details see K. Lübeck, *Reichseinteilung und kirchliche Hierarchie des Orients bis zum Ausgange des vierten Jahrhunderts*, *Kirchengeschichtliche Studien*, published by Knöpfler, Schrörs, Sdralek, 5, Heft 4 (Münster i. W., 1901), pp. 7-17. Cf. also F. B. C. Maassen, *Der Primat des Bischofs von Rom* (Bonn, 1853), pp. 1-7.

CHURCH ORGANIZATION

communities of Galatia, Pontus, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, and Paul to that of Galatia and to the communities of the capitals of political provinces: Rome (Italy), Ephesus (Asia), Corinth (Achaëa), Thessalonica (Macedonia). As a passage in the second Epistle to the Corinthians (II Cor: 1,1) indicates, these letters were meant to be sent by the bishop of each capital to other cities of the province. The letter communicating the decision of the apostles with regard to the observation of Mosaic precepts was sent (Acts 15: 22,23) to the brethren in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia. Antioch was the capital of Syria, and Cilicia formed, at that time, a single administrative unit. It should be noted that St. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, was well aware of this because in one of his letters (to the Romans, 2:2) he calls himself, Bishop of Syria. This, of course, does not mean that the bishops of these cities received from the apostles a superior rank in the original Christian hierarchy. But the nature of Roman political and economic organization was such that all political and social life in the provinces centered in their capitals, and it was to the advantage of the first missionaries to use these centers for the dissemination of Christianity. So it happened that from the outset the Church was obliged, for reasons of practical expediency deriving from the political and economic conditions of the Roman Empire, to adapt its ecclesiastical organization, especially in the East, to the political division of the Empire.

The same factor influenced the further evolution of Church organization. The consideration of important problems arising from the spread of Christianity through the different provinces, and the development of doctrine forced the bishops, from the latter part of the second century onward, to call special councils.² The choice of meeting places again was dictated by administrative expediency rather than by the consideration that the see of any particular city had been founded by an apostle. It was more convenient to hold such gatherings in the political centers of the provinces where the imperial cult was focused and the provincial

² See for details K. Lübeck, *op. cit.*, pp. 32 seq., with numerous quotations from the sources. Cf. also C. J. Hefele, H. Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles*, 1, pt. 1 (Paris, 1907), pp. 125 seq., and R. Sohm, *Kirchenrecht* (Munich, Leipzig, 1923), pp. 281-296.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

assemblies held, and to leave to the local bishop the initiative of convoking the council and the privilege of presiding over its debates. This gave to the bishop of a provincial capital a kind of superiority over other bishops of the province. In only a few instances were such provincial centers at the same time apostolic foundations; for example Ephesus, capital of the province of Asia, Corinth, capital of Achaëa, and Thessalonica, capital of Macedonia. Such was the origin of the metropolitan bishops, and of their rights in the election and supervision of the bishops in their provinces.

This administrative framework was formally sanctioned by the Council of Nicaea (325) whose fourth canon³ decreed: "A new bishop shall be installed by all bishops of the province [ἐπαρχία]. Should this, however, be difficult, either because of pressing necessity or because of great distances, at least three of them shall come together, and, with the written agreement of the others, shall perform the consecration [χειροτονία]. The confirmation of what has been done shall be given by the metropolitan of each province."

There is no doubt about the meaning of the words ἐπαρχία and "metropolitan." The administrative unit was becoming also an ecclesiastical unit governed by the bishop of the metropolis or capital of the administrative unit. The signatures of the bishops present at the Council of Nicaea in 325 throw light on ecclesiastical organization in the eastern part of the Empire. A comparison with the political division of the eastern provinces⁴ shows clearly that at the beginning of the fourth century the Church officially adopted the administrative division of the Empire as the basis for its own organization.

By approving their canon the Fathers condemned the actions of Meletius, Bishop of Lykopolis in the Thebaid who, contrary to

³ Mansi, 2, col. 669: 'Επίσκοπον προήκει μάλιστα μὲν ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ καθίστασθαι. Εἰ δὲ δυσχερὲς εἴη τὸ τοιοῦτο, ἢ διὰ κατεπείγουσαν ἀνάγκην, ἢ διὰ μῆκος ὁδοῦ, ἐξ ἀπαντος τρεῖς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συναγομένους, συμπήφων γινομένων καὶ τῶν ἀπόντων, καὶ συντιθεμένων διὰ γραμμάτων, τότε τὴν χειροτονίαν ποιείσθαι. Τὸ δὲ κύρος τῶν γενομένων διδόνθαι καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπαρχίαν τῷ μητροπολίτῃ.

⁴ For details see K. Lübeck, *op. cit.*, pp. 73-98.

CHURCH ORGANIZATION

the custom of that time, had ordained bishops in parts of the country which were under the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan of Alexandria, and had, thereby, caused a local schism in Egypt.⁵ To prevent such incidents, the Fathers, in canon four, sternly reminded all concerned that the established practice was in the future to be strictly observed: every administrative province was to form an ecclesiastical unit under the jurisdiction of the bishop of the metropolis, and the ordination of new bishops was to concern the bishops of the entire province acting in mutual agreement, subject to the approval of the metropolitan.

That such was the intention of the Nicene Fathers was confirmed in 341 by the provincial synod of Antioch which decreed by canon nine:⁶ "The bishops of every province shall know that the bishop who is at the head of the metropolis has the whole province under his care and supervision, for those who have business to conduct must converge from all directions on the metropolis. Hence it is decreed that he shall also be granted precedence in matters of rank, and that the other bishops shall undertake nothing of importance without consulting him, in accordance with the canon of our Fathers prevailing from old, except insofar as it concerned the *paroikia* [bishopric] of each one, and the lands which belonged to it." Then follows the definition of bishops' rights and duties in their bishoprics. The text illustrates also why the metropolitan bishops of the provinces gained such precedence over their colleagues: because all political and economic life in the provinces was concentrated in the capitals, and, therefore, "all who have business to conduct must converge from all directions on the metropolis."

The principles laid down by the Nicene Fathers were further stressed by Pope Boniface (418-422),⁷ who declared that in every

⁵ See B. J. Kidd, *A History of the Church to A.D. 461*, 2 (Oxford, 1922), pp. 41 seq. Cf. also H. Linck, *Zur Übersetzung und Erläuterung der Kanones IV, VI, und VII des Konzils von Nicaea* (Giessen, 1908), pp. 18-37, on the importance of the Meletius affair for the wording of the canons of Nicaea and of the synodal letter to the Church of Alexandria.

⁶ Mansi, 2, col. 1312. Cf. also canons thirteen, fifteen, nineteen, twenty, cols. 1313, 1316.

⁷ Mansi, 4, col. 396, *PL*, 20, *Epist.* 12, col. 773: *Nulli etenim videtur incognita synodi constitutio Nicaenae, quae ita praecipit, ut eadem proprie verba ponamus. Per unamquamque provinciam jus metropolitano singulos habere debere, nec cuiquam duas esse subjectas.*

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

province there should be only one metropolitan, and that no metropolitan should rule over two provinces. These principles were defended by Pope Innocent I (402-417)⁸ and the Council of Chalcedon⁹ against violations by either bishops or emperors.

The Nicene Fathers went even further, and provided, consciously or unconsciously, a basis for the formation of a supra-metropolitan body in the Church. This was again in conformity with the existing political division of the eastern parts of the Empire. In canon six they declared:¹⁰ "The old order shall continue to prevail in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis; namely that the Bishop of Alexandria shall exercise supreme power over all these places, as is also the case with the Bishop of Rome who has the same powers. In a similar way shall their rights be preserved with regard to the Church of Antioch and to the Churches in other eparchies."

The text of the canon again indicates that the Fathers intended to confirm something which had developed in earlier Church organization. With regard to Alexandria, the development is clear. As the political center of Ptolemaic Egypt, it became the city in which all the social and economic life of the Ptolemaic Empire was concentrated, and it retained this importance under Roman rule, for Octavian, after assuming the direct administration of Egypt in 27 B.C. did not incorporate it into other imperial provinces,¹¹ but reserved it for himself as an imperial "Hausgut" or patrimony, permitting the country its own organization, and retaining Alexandria as its capital. Not only was the imperial cult concentrated in this great city,¹² but the numerous Jewish settlements in the

⁸ *PL*, 20, *Epist.* 24, chap. 2, col. 548. Cf. K. Lübeck, *op. cit.*, pp. 65 seq. for the explanation of this letter. Cf. *infra* p. 13.

⁹ Mansi, 7, col. 364, canon twelve.

¹⁰ Mansi, 2, cols. 669 seq.: Τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθνη κρατεῖτω, τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ Λιβύῃ καὶ Πενταπόλει, ὥστε τὸν Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπίσκοπον πάντων τούτων ἔχειν τὴν ἐξουσίαν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ τῷ ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐπισκόπῳ τοῦτο συνήθες ἐστίν· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν, καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐπαρχίαις, τὰ πρεσβεία σώζεσθαι ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. Cf. F. B. C. Maassen, *op. cit.*, pp. 12-39.

¹¹ Cf. Th. E. Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte*, 5 (Berlin, 1894), pp. 554 seq. A. Stein, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Verwaltung Ägyptens unter römischer Herrschaft* (Stuttgart, 1915), pp. 35 seq., 79 seq.

¹² A. Stein, *ibid.*, pp. 31-33.

CHURCH ORGANIZATION

Egyptian provinces were also governed from this center by the chief of the Alexandrian Jews.¹³ Christianity spread, of course, from Alexandria into the rest of the country, and its diffusion was directed by the bishop of the capital. All of this made it natural for Egyptian Christians to regard the bishops of Alexandria as their supreme pastors, and it was, therefore, easy for the latter to maintain their authority in all Egyptian provinces.

The authority of the Alexandrian bishops over the Egyptian provinces was so firmly established by the end of the third century that there the Nicene Fathers had to make an exception and to ignore the new division of the Empire decreed by Diocletian in 297.¹⁴ This deprived Egypt of the special political status conferred by Augustus, and brought about its incorporation into the diocese¹⁵ of the Orient, with its capital at Antioch. The rivalry between the Syrians and the Egyptians which so often in the past had flared into sharp political and national conflicts may have helped the Fathers to overlook this new situation. It could hardly be expected that the Egyptian Church would ever have submitted to that of Syria, but it must be borne in mind that in this case failure to adapt ecclesiastical organization to political changes was dictated by the previous political development of Egypt, and by the role that the city of Alexandria had played for centuries in the political, social, and economic life of that country.

Apparently, in the case of Alexandria, the Fathers had to make another exception to the general rule that was being adopted everywhere else in the Church, for the supreme authority of the Alexandrian bishops in Egypt was indicated by limiting to themselves the privilege of consecrating all bishops, even though the latter might have been elected by the communities and recommended to the bishop of Alexandria for approval and consecration.

The question of whether there were any metropolitan bishops

¹³ K. J. Marquardt, *L'administration romaine*, pt. 2. *L'organisation de l'empire romain*, 2 (French transl., Paris, 1892), p. 423.

¹⁴ See E. Kornemann, "Diocesis," in Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclopädie*, 5 (Stuttgart, 1905), cols. 727-734. On Diocletian's administrative reforms see W. Seston, *Diocletien et la tétrarchie* (Paris, 1946), pp. 294-351. Cf. also E. Stein, *Geschichte des spätromischen Reiches*, 1 (Vienna, 1928), pp. 103 seq.

¹⁵ The word "diocese," like "province," is used here in the Roman administrative sense and not in the modern ecclesiastical sense.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

in the Egyptian provinces at the beginning of the fourth century is still debated among specialists. R. Sohm¹⁶ rejected the prevalent opinion that a metropolitan organization existed in Egypt at that time. He asserted that the bishop of Alexandria was the real bishop, and that the others acted only as his suffragans, dependent on him in every respect. Lübeck¹⁷ presented strong arguments for the existence of metropolitans in Libya, Pentapolis, and Thebaid, prior to the Council of Nicaea. This view was opposed by K. Müller¹⁸ whose reasoning deserves serious consideration. The wording of canon six seems to favor Müller's interpretation in linking Alexandria with Rome. This is important, for if there were no metropolitans in the diocese of Italy at the time of the Council, all Italian bishops being subject directly to the Bishop of Rome, the same situation could be assumed to have existed in Egypt. The Fathers seem here to confirm a situation which had developed in Egypt, and which could be regarded as contrary to their decision, proclaimed in canon four, that there should be a metropolitan in every province.

If this interpretation is correct, it must be concluded that the bishops of Alexandria were officially given not only a metropolitan, but also a supra-metropolitan status, for their jurisdiction must then have extended over all the provinces of Egypt rather than merely over one province alone. In this way, perhaps, the controversial opinions concerning the status of Alexandria could be reconciled.

The wisdom of the Nicene Fathers' decision concerning the independence of Egypt is illustrated by the fact that even the political authorities soon came to the conclusion that Egypt should be given the status of a diocese. It was between the years 380 and 382 that Egypt became an independent diocese, exempt from the administrative authority of the *comes Orientis*, who had from 335, replaced the *vicarius Orientis* residing in Antioch.¹⁹

¹⁶ R. Sohm, *op. cit.*, pp. 403 seq. Cf. also H. Linck, *op. cit.*, pp. 31-37.

¹⁷ K. Lübeck, *op. cit.*, pp. 116-134.

¹⁸ K. Müller, "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Verfassung der alten Kirche," *Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse* (Berlin, 1922), pp. 18 seq.

¹⁹ See on this minor point G. Downey, *A Study of the Comites Orientis and the Consulares Syriae* (Princeton, 1939), p. 9.

CHURCH ORGANIZATION

It is, therefore, almost certain that in 381, when the Council of Constantinople was in session, Egypt already existed as an administrative unit, independent of the diocese of the Orient.²⁰ The ecclesiastical organization was thus again in accord with the administrative division of the eastern part of the Empire.

Diocletian's division of the Empire was, however, especially beneficial to Antioch. The rise of its bishops derived from apostolic times, though Antioch seems to have lost its leading position during the second century. Its bishops played no role in the controversy over the date for celebrating Easter, and none of the numerous synods during that controversy were held there. In spite of this, however, Serapion, the Bishop of Antioch (190-211) acted as arbiter in a religious quarrel troubling the Christians of Rhossos in Cilicia,²¹ and he seems to have done so as if it had been his right. He is also said to have consecrated a bishop for Edessa, a city which had previously been in more intimate relationship with Jerusalem and Palestine.²² The prestige of Antioch must thus have been maintained despite the inconspicuous role of its bishops in the religious life of the East during the second century and the first half of the third.

The situation changed, however, in the latter half of the third century. The bishops of Syria and Asia Minor assembled in Antioch three times between 263 and 268 to judge Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch, who was arraigned because of his heretical views and wordly life.²³ These bishops acted as a group, conscious of the unity derived from their belonging to the same province, or from their being similarly attracted by the prestige of Antioch. At the synods

²⁰ See Th. E. Mommsen "Verzeichnis der römischen Provinzen aufgesetzt um 297," *Abhandlungen der k. Preuss. Akad. der Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl.* 1862 (Berlin, 1863), pp. 494-496. Cf. K. Lübeck, *op. cit.*, pp. 162 seq.

²¹ Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica*, 6, 12; *PG*, 20, col. 545; ed. E. Schwartz, *Griechische Christliche Schriftsteller*, 9, pp. 544 seq.

²² "The Doctrine of the Apostle Addaeus; Martyrdom of Barsamya," ed. W. Cureton, *Ancient Syriac Documents* (London, 1864), pp. 23, 71. Cf. L. Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien* (Paris, 1909), p. 19.

²³ Mansi, 1, cols. 1031 ff., 1089 ff. For details and a complete bibliography on this subject consult H. de Riedmatten, *Les Actes du procès de Paul de Samosate. Etude sur la christologie du III^e au IV^e siècle* (Fribourg en Suisse, 1952).

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

of the bishops of Syria and Asia Minor at Ancyra (314) and Neocaesarea (315 or 320)²⁴ the bishops of Antioch presided as a matter of course.

The administrative reforms introduced by Diocletian stabilized this situation. The Emperor created the diocese of the Orient, administered by a *vicarius*, whose residence was Antioch, capital of Coele Syria.²⁵ His jurisdiction extended over all Roman provinces from Arabia to the boundary of Armenia, including Isauria and Cilicia in Asia Minor, as well as Egypt, and this situation was further consolidated by Constantine, who in 335, in order to check the danger from Persia, replaced the *vicarius Orientis* by a *comes* in whose hands administrative and military powers were concentrated. Thus, at the time of the Council of Nicaea, Antioch already occupied a privileged position in Church organization, similar to that of Alexandria.

The wording of canon six of the Council indicates clearly, however, that the rights claimed by the bishops of Antioch were not the same as those of the bishops of Rome and Alexandria. Their claims are said to be not identical with, but only similar to, those of their two great colleagues, which indicates that the bishops of Antioch did not assume the right to ordain bishops for all Christian communities in the diocese of which Antioch was capital.

It is still a matter of debate whether the rights thus confirmed to the bishops of Antioch by the Fathers were those of an ordinary metropolitan or those of a supra-metropolitan. A clear explanation depends on the interpretation of the wording of canon six. K. Müller²⁶ thinks that the Fathers had in mind the traditional rights which had developed in some Mother Churches, and which sometimes conflicted with the new regulations contained in canon four. The bishops of many Mother Churches were accustomed to select bishops for the communities which their missionaries had con-

²⁴ Mansi, 2, cols. 513 ff., 539. Cf. C. J. Hefele, H. Leclercq, *op. cit.*, 1, pt. 1 pp. 298 ff., 326 ff. B. J. Kidd, *op. cit.*, 1, pp. 543 ff.

²⁵ On the political development of Syria under Roman rule, see K. J. Marquardt, *op. cit.*, 2, pp. 331-384.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 22-27. Cf. R. Sohm, *op. cit.*, pp. 398 seq., and K. Lübeck, *op. cit.*, pp. 134-140.

CHURCH ORGANIZATION

verted, and it was the wish of the Fathers that these established rights in Alexandria, Antioch, and other eparchies be preserved.

Even if this interpretation is accepted, it must be admitted that, in the case of Antioch, these rights were greater than those of a metropolitan in a province of which his see was the capital. Such rights were guaranteed to every metropolitan by canon four. Antioch must have acquired, before the Council of Nicaea, direct jurisdiction over an area wider than a province.

In the case of Antioch, less documentary evidence survives than in the case of Alexandria, and it is difficult to say whether the Fathers acknowledged the authority of the bishop of Antioch over the metropolitans of all the provinces of the diocese of the Orient, or only his right to ordain bishops in some areas outside the province of Syria over which he had direct jurisdiction as metropolitan.

A passage from the letter sent by Pope Innocent I (402-417) to Bishop Alexander of Antioch suggests that at the time of the Nicene Council Antioch enjoyed direct jurisdiction extending beyond the limits of its province. After confirming Alexander's interpretation of the Nicene decision as extending his jurisdiction over the whole diocese, the Pope indicates how Alexander should proceed in the ordination of bishops:²⁷ "Therefore we think, most beloved brother, that, as you ordain the metropolitans according to your special powers, so you should not allow other bishops to be ordained without your knowledge and permission. In this the proper procedure would be to allow, through written consent, the bishops in distant places to be ordained by those who do so now according to their own judgment only. If you so wish, you should summon the candidates of the neighboring sees to present themselves for ordination by your grace."

It is true that the text is not very clear, but it can be supposed that the neighboring bishops, whose ordination by the bishop of

²⁷ *Epistola XXIV*, P. Coustant, *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum*, 1, (Paris, 1721), cols. 851 seq.; *PL*, 20, chap. 1, col. 548: *Itaque arbitramur frater carissime, ut sicut metropolitanos auctoritate ordinas singulari, sic et ceteros non sine permissu conscientiae tuae sinas episcopos procreari. In quibus hunc modum recte servabis, ut longe positos litteris datis ordinari censeas ab his qui nunc eos suo tantum ordinant arbitratu: vicinos autem si aestimas, ad manus impositionem tuae gratiae statuas pervenire.*

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

Antioch is mentioned in the letters, are not only those of the province of Syria. These bishops regarded him in any event as their metropolitan, and it would have been superfluous to stress Alexander's right to ordain them. This distinction between the neighboring and distant sees of the diocese becomes more logical if the neighboring sees are assumed to mean those belonging to provinces other than Syria.

Of course in the same letter the Pope speaks about the jurisdiction of the bishop of Antioch over the whole diocese of the Orient.²⁸ It is perfectly reasonable to refuse to see in this statement any proof that, at the time of the Nicene Council, Antioch exercised jurisdiction over the entire diocese. The Pope's words show, however, that by the beginning of the fifth century Antioch had become a supra-metropolis with jurisdiction over all of the diocese of the Orient.²⁹ This is the final stage of an evolution which started at the beginning of the fourth century, and which found a juridical basis in canon six of the Nicene Council giving greater rights to the bishops of Antioch than an ordinary metropolitan could claim.

It therefore cannot be said that the bishop of Antioch was promoted by the Fathers of Nicaea to a position of supra-metropolitan with authority over the whole diocese of the Orient except Egypt, though it must be admitted that the judgment given by the Fathers enabled the bishops of Antioch easily to extend their jurisdiction over the whole of the diocese, and in this respect they may have interpreted the sixth Nicene canon in a light favorable to their ambitions. The letter addressed by Alexander to Innocent I reveals that the process of Antiochene expansion met with some opposition from the metropolitans of the provinces.

Innocent I says in his reply³⁰ that this honor was accorded to

²⁸ P. Coustant, *ibid*; col. 851; *PL*, 20, col. 517: *Revolventes itaque auctoritatem Nicaenae synodi, quae una omnium per orbem terrarum mentem explicat sacerdotum, quae censuit de Antiochena ecclesia cunctis fidelibus, ne dixerim sacerdotibus, esse necessarium custodire, qua super dioecesim suam praedictam ecclesiam non super aliquam provinciam recognoscimus constitutam.*

²⁹ Jerome's outburst against John, Bishop of Jerusalem (see the quotation *infra*, p. 22. *PL*, 23, col. 407), can also be accepted only as proof that in Jerome's time Antioch exercised its jurisdiction over all of the diocese of the Orient.

³⁰ P. Coustant, *op. cit.*, col. 851, *PL*, 20, col. 517.

CHURCH ORGANIZATION

Antioch by the Nicene Fathers not so much because of the importance of the city itself, but because it had been honored by the presence of St. Peter; and that it was inferior to Rome only because the apostle had made a temporary stay within its walls, whereas he had made Rome his permanent see and had died there.

This papal interpretation reveals to what extent the idea of apostolicity was appreciated in Rome at the beginning of the fifth century.³¹ The Nicene Fathers were undoubtedly aware of Peter's stay in Antioch, but this was not their reason for confirming the city's privileges.

How slight a role the idea of apostolicity had played in the rise of Antioch to such ecclesiastical prominence is illustrated by the fact that the Antiochenes did not consider the Apostle Peter to have been their first bishop though such a claim might have seemed quite natural in view of the fact that Peter stayed in Antioch, and that he was the chief of the apostles. Thus it was that Eusebius,³² who had read the catalogue of the bishops of Antioch, quoted Eudodius as the first bishop and St. Ignatius as his successor. In this respect the Antiochenes followed the old Christian tradition which regarded the apostles as teachers of the whole world and was reluctant to call them bishops of particular cities. We shall see that this tradition had prevailed also in Rome up to the beginning of the fourth century.³³

What is the meaning of the last part of the canon that speaks of the rights of Churches in other eparchies? Ought it to be interpreted as a measure to protect the rights of the Mother Churches, whose bishops sometimes exercised jurisdiction over Churches outside their provinces?³⁴ This is possible, but, if so, why did the Fathers add the injunction that should a bishop be ordained without the consent of a metropolitan, he should not be allowed to

³¹ Cf. *infra*, pp. 70 seq.

³² *Hist. eccles.*, 3, 22; *PG*, 20, col. 256; ed. Schwartz, p. 236. The tradition attributing to St. Peter seven years of episcopal activity in Antioch seems to have originated at the time of Gregory the Great (590-604) and to have been of Roman origin. Cf. Gregory's *Epistola ad Eulogium Alexandrinum*, 7, *Epist.* 40; *PL*, 77, col. 899.

³³ See *infra*, pp. 40 seq.

³⁴ K. Müller, "Beiträge," *op. cit.*, pp. 25-27.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

exercise his functions?³⁵ If the Fathers intended to protect the established rights of Mother Churches, this limitation nullified their concession, for, if a bishop of such a Church were to appoint a bishop to another Church outside or inside his province, he had to do so with the permission of the metropolitan. This implies a cancellation of the established rights of Mother Churches.

However, E. Schwarz³⁶ succeeded in determining the original wording of this part of the canon, and his discovery gives a new meaning to the passage. The wording of canon six, quoted above,^{36a} is taken from the collection of the *Nomocanon* of Fourteen Titles, based on the sixth-century canonical collection composed by John Scholasticus.³⁷ The oldest Latin translation of the Nicene canons gives, however, a different reading of this passage:³⁸ *Similiter autem et qui in Antiochia constitutus est: et in ceteris provinciis primatus habeant ecclesiae civitatum ampliorum*. The *civitates ampliores* is an old Latin translation of the Greek word *metropolis* with which the Latins were not familiar at the beginning of the fourth century.

This oldest Roman version is similar to the translation of this canon which was read in 418 at the Synod of Carthage:³⁹ *Nec non et apud Antiochiam itaque et in aliis provinciis propria iura servantur metropolitanis ecclesiis*. This translation was made from a copy of the canons brought from Nicaea in 325 by Caecilian, Bishop of Carthage, who attended the Council. The Council of Carthage decided to request the bishops of Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople to send to Carthage an authentic text of the

³⁵ Mansi, 2, col. 672, canon six: καθόλου δὲ πρόδηλον ἐκεῖνο, ὅτι εἴ τις χωρὶς γνώμης τοῦ μητροπολίτου γένοιτο ἐπίσκοπος, τὸν τοιοῦτον ἡ μεγάλη σύνοδος ὥρισε μὴ δεῖν εἶναι ἐπίσκοπον· ἐὰν μὲντοι τῇ κοινῇ πάντων ψήφῳ εὐλόγῳ οὔσῃ καὶ κατὰ κανόνα ἐκκλησιαστικόν, δύο ἢ τρεῖς δι' οἰκείαν φιλονεικίαν ἀντιλέγωσι, κρατεῖτω ἡ τῶν πλείονων ψῆφος.

³⁶ "Der sechste nicänische Kanon auf der Synode von Chalkedon," *Sitzungsberichte der Preuss. Akad. der Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl.*, 27 (1930), pp. 633-640.

^{36a} P. 8.

³⁷ V. N. Benešević, "Ioannis Scholastici Syntagma L. Titulorum," *Abhandlungen der Bayrischen Akad. der Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl.*, N. F., Heft 14 (1937), p. 32. *Syntagma Canonum XIV titulorum*. PG, 104, col. 468 (tit. I, chap. V).

³⁸ C. H. Turner, *Ecclesiae occidentalis Monumenta iuris antiquissima*, 1 (Oxford, 1899), p. 121 (Codex Ingilrami).

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 120 (I). Cf. *ibid.*, p. 581.

CHURCH ORGANIZATION

Nicene canons. Atticus of Constantinople sent the Greek text to Carthage and added a Latin translation made in Constantinople. This material later reached Pope Boniface in Rome. Atticus' translation of the passage in question reads thus:⁴⁰ *Similiter autem et circa Antiochiam et in ceteris provinciis privilegia propria reserventur metropolitanis ecclesiis*. The same version is also to be found in the *Prisca*,⁴¹ the oldest collection of Roman canon law, which is based on the tradition preserved in the manuscript of Chieti and in the translation sent by Atticus.

Thus it appears, that the primitive text of the sixth canon contained the words ταῖς τῶν μητροπόλεων ἐκκλησίαις, and that the words τῶν μητροπόλεων were dropped in the early collection of canon law which originated, as E. Schwartz⁴² has convincingly shown, in Antioch. The altered text was used by the bishops of that city in their struggle for power against the metropolitans of the diocese of the Orient who opposed Antioch's pretensions. This version was also introduced in Rome, probably from Antioch, and can even be found in the translation of Nicene canons made under Pope Innocent I.

This passage of the canon simply confirms, therefore, all the prerogatives that the metropolitan bishops had gradually acquired over the provincial bishops. Further confirmation is found in the ensuing canon regulating the election of bishops, which states that no bishop may be ordained without the consent of the metropolitan.

This interpretation contradicts the opinion of many scholars⁴³ who think that in this passage the Fathers had in mind the bishops of the other three main cities of the East—Ephesus, Caesarea, and Heracleia—which had begun to claim jurisdiction over the dioceses of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace in conformity with the new organization of the Empire. Those who oppose this interpretation rightly point out that, if the Fathers had been thinking of these three capitals of Eastern dioceses, they would have inserted the

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 611 seq. (Atticus' letter), 120 (canon six in Atticus' version).

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 121 (III).

⁴² *Op. cit.*, pp. 635–640.

⁴³ See K. Lübeck, *op. cit.*, pp. 140–148, where numerous bibliographical indications will be found.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

names of the capitals in the canon, as they had inserted those of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch.

However, although this passage of the canon cannot be quoted as proof that the Fathers intended to introduce a supra-metropolitan organization in the Church, it does not exclude the possibility that the other diocesan capitals were trying to extend their jurisdiction over bishoprics beyond their own provinces. The fact that the Fathers felt obliged to stress in canons four and six the rights of the metropolitans in their provinces indicates that there were some attempts to disregard those rights. Such attempts might have come from the bishops of the diocesan capitals, acting in imitation of the bishops of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch whose direct jurisdiction extended beyond their respective ecclesiastical provinces. The Fathers were ready to give full approval of the practice for only Rome and Alexandria, and more limited approval for Antioch. They discouraged its spread to other dioceses, and protected the rights of the metropolitans.

Canon six cannot therefore be interpreted as the *magna charta* of a supra-metropolitan organization, accommodated to the division of the Empire into dioceses. Nevertheless, there are strong indications that the whole development of Church organization was moving in that direction, and that this evolution was somewhat accelerated by the stipulations of the canon. This impression seems strengthened by the wording of canon two, voted by the Fathers of the Second Oecumenical Council which met in Constantinople only fifty-six years after the Council of Nicaea. It reads as follows:⁴⁴ "According to the canons, the bishop of Alexandria should limit himself to the administration of Egypt, the bishops of the Orient should administer only the Orient, provided that the rights of the Church of Antioch described in the canons of Nicaea be respected, the bishops of the dioceses of Asia, Pontus,

⁴⁴ Mansi, 3, col. 560: ἀλλὰ κατὰ τοὺς κανόνας, τὸν μὲν Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπίσκοπον τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ μόνον οἰκονομεῖν· τοὺς δὲ τῆς Ἀνατολῆς ἐπισκόπους τὴν ἀνατολὴν μόνην διοικεῖν· φυλαττομένων τῶν ἐν τοῖς κανόσι τοῖς κατὰ Νικαίαν πρεσβείων τῇ Ἀντιοχείῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ· καὶ τοὺς τῆς Ἀσιανῆς διοικήσεως ἐπισκόπους τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν μόνην οἰκονομεῖν· καὶ τοὺς τῆς Ποντικῆς, τὰ τῆς Ποντικῆς μόνον· καὶ τοὺς τῆς Θράκης, τὰ τῆς Θρακικῆς μόνον οἰκονομεῖν.

CHURCH ORGANIZATION

and Thrace, respectively, should administer the affairs of only those dioceses."

It is evident from this canon that the Fathers were anxious to keep the organization of the Church in strict conformity with the framework of the political divisions of the Empire. The wording of the canon shows, moreover, that such was the intention also of the Fathers of Nicaea, or, at least, that the decisions were interpreted in that sense. The new ordinance was intended only to reinforce a prescription issued by the First Oecumenical Council. The canons invoked at the beginning of this injunction can only be those of Nicaea. Regarding the rights of the bishops of Antioch guaranteed at Nicaea, it may be that these were questioned by the metropolitans of the provinces for whose communities the bishop of Antioch claimed the privilege of episcopal ordination. The Council therefore once again confirmed these rights.

The sixth canon, attributed to the Second Oecumenical Council, but voted most probably by the Council which assembled in Constantinople in 382,⁴⁵ confirms the impression that Church organization was progressing along the lines of the political division of the Empire toward the formation of supra-metropolitan units corresponding to imperial dioceses. The canon establishes that complaints against a bishop had first to be examined by the provincial synod. The plaintiff could appeal the judgment of the provincial synod to a larger synod of bishops from the civil diocese.⁴⁶

Even if the most cautious interpretation of this canon⁴⁷ were accepted—namely, that it was not the intention of the Fathers to assemble a synod of the whole diocese, and that the larger synod was to be convoked by the same metropolitan who had presided over the first synod—it must be admitted that there was an unmistakable tendency to create a supra-metropolitan organism as a second means of appeal.

Because the canon speaks of dioceses in general, its meaning

⁴⁵ Cf. C. J. Hefele, H. Leclercq, *op. cit.*, 2, pt. 1 (Paris, 1908), pp. 18 seq.

⁴⁶ Mansi, 3, col. 561D: εἰ δὲ συμβαίῃ ἀδυνατῆσαι τοὺς ἐπαρχιώτας πρὸς διόρθωσιν τῶν ἐπιφερομένων ἐγκλημάτων τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ τότε αὐτοὺς προσιέναι μείζονι συνόδῳ τῶν τῆς διοικήσεως ἐπισκόπων ἐκείνης, ὑπὲρ τῆς αἰτίας ταύτης συγκαλουμένων.

⁴⁷ Proposed by K. Müller, "Kanon 2 und 6 von Konstantinopel 381 und 382," in *Festgabe für A. Jülicher* (Tübingen, 1937), pp. 190–202.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

could not have been restricted to the dioceses of Egypt and the Orient only. It was to be applied to all civil dioceses of the eastern part of the Empire, including the minor dioceses of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace. Even if it be supposed that the larger council could have been convoked by the metropolitan of the province where the first synod had met, the logical development would have been for the bishops of the diocesan capitals to play the principal role in such cases. Thus the impartiality of the second tribunal—the larger synod—would have been more strongly guaranteed.

Actually, this tendency appears in the ordinance issued July 30, 381, by which the Emperor Theodosius I confirmed the decisions of the Council.⁴⁸ After declaring that the Churches were to be administered by bishops professing the Nicene Creed, the Emperor orders the bishops to establish unity of belief in all dioceses. He mentions the names of the prelates of proved orthodoxy in every diocese with whom the bishops should be in communion in order to obtain possession of the churches from the magistrates. The first listed is Nectarius, Bishop of Constantinople, then follow, for the diocese of Egypt, Timothy of Alexandria, and for that of the Orient, Pelagius of Laodicea and Diodorus of Tarsus. Antioch is not mentioned because the see was still vacant. For the diocese of Asia, Amphilochius of Iconium and Optimus of Antioch in Pisidia, are named, but Ephesus is omitted because the see was occupied by a heretic. For the diocese of Pontus, Helladius of Caesarea, Otreius of Melitene, Gregory of Nyssa, Terennius of Scythia, and Marmarius of Marcianopolis are listed. The diocese of Thrace is not mentioned, and it is justifiable to suppose that the Bishop of Constantinople was regarded as the most competent authority in that diocese.

The principle of adaption to the administrative organization of the Empire is here fully applied, and it can rightly be assumed that the bishops of the diocesan capitals soon became the most prominent leaders. In point of fact, the bishops of Caesarea, Ephesus, and Heracleia are listed at the head of the Klesis of 218 as metropolitans of the three minor dioceses which, according to

⁴⁸ *Codex Theodosianus*, 16, 1, 3; ed. P. Krueger, Th. E. Mommsen (Berlin, 1905), p. 834.

CHURCH ORGANIZATION

E. Gerland,⁴⁹ were formed at the end of the fourth century. Their prominence is indicated, too, by the circumstance that each of them bore the title of exarch, a title found also in the signatures of the Council of 680.⁵⁰ Exarchs are mentioned in canon nine of the Council of Chalcedon, and it would be logical to surmise that these were the three bishops meant.⁵¹

The canons of the Council of Constantinople are, unfortunately, couched in very general terms, and for lack of other documentary evidence the growth of Eastern Church organization is unlikely ever to be clearly traced. According to the canon, the division of the whole Eastern Church into bodies whose territories coincided with the boundaries of the civil dioceses indicates clearly that supra-metropolitan organisms were being formed in the East, and from other evidence given above, it is clear that the bishops of the diocesan capitals were gradually becoming supra-metropolitans.

This development is important. Canon six of the Council of Nicaea and canon two of the Council of Constantinople laid the foundation for the further development of Church organization and for its division into patriarchates. From this it may be concluded that Ephesus, Caesarea in Cappadocia, and Heracleia in Thrace were also destined to develop into autonomous patriarchates because they were capitals of political dioceses of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace, but this evolution was disturbed by the rise of Constantinople which assumed supreme jurisdiction over the three dioceses.

There is yet another Nicene canon which illustrates the reluctance of the Fathers to grant an exception to the general rule of adaptation to the administrative division of the Empire. The bishops of Jerusalem were eager to obtain a status more commensurate in importance with the holiness of their city and with the growing veneration of the faithful for the Holy Places, for this new

⁴⁹ E. Gerland, *Die Genesis der Notitia, episcopatum, in Corpus notitiarum episcopatum Ecclesiae Orientalis Graecae*, I (Kadiköy, 1931), p. 8.

⁵⁰ Mansi, II, cols. 688, 689: Φιλαλήθης, ἀνάξιος ἐπίσκοπος τῆς Καισαρέων μητροπόλεως, καὶ ἑξαρχος τῆς Ποντικῆς διοικήσεως . . . Θεόδωρος . . . ἑξαρχος τῆς Ἀσιανῶν διοικήσεως. But Sisinnius of Heracleia is called only Bishop τῆς Ἡρακλεοτῶν μητροπόλεως τῆς Εὐρωπαϊῶν ἐπαρχίας.

⁵¹ Cf. E. Honigsmann, "Le 'Corpus notitiarum episcopatum,'" *Byzantion* 11 (1936), pp. 346 seq. Cf. *infra*, p. 92.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

city of Aelia Capitolina, which had risen on the ruins of Jerusalem, had always been subject in ecclesiastical matters to Caesarea, the new metropolis of Palestine.

The Fathers shared the veneration of other Christians for the Holy Places, but were not yet prepared to disregard the existing situation created by the principle of adaptation to previous administrative divisions. Therefore, they granted the bishop of Jerusalem the honorary status of only a metropolitan, leaving him under the jurisdiction of Caesarea and Antioch. This is the meaning of canon seven, voted by the Council:⁵²

"Because it is an established custom and an old tradition that the Bishop of Aelia should be treated with special honor, he shall thus enjoy precedence of honor, but in such a way that the metropolis shall preserve the dignity which is its right."

There does not seem to be any evidence that the see of Jerusalem, because it was founded by an apostle, was regarded as more venerable than other sees. Clement of Alexandria's report on the election of James as Bishop of Jerusalem—a report preserved by Eusebius⁵³—indicates that Jerusalem was regarded as the most venerable see because Christ preached and died there, but in spite of this, says Clement, the three most distinguished apostles—Peter, John, and James—did not quarrel over the honor of becoming bishop of the sacred city, but elected James to the office.

The supra-metropolitan organization, founded on the political division of the Empire into dioceses, for which the Councils of Nicaea and Constantinople laid the basis, was accepted as a matter of course in the East. That it was in full operation toward the end of the fourth century is illustrated by Jerome's letter—of 396 or 397—to Pammachius concerning John, Bishop of Jerusalem, who asked Theophilus, Bishop of Alexandria, to act as an intermediary in his controversy with Bishop Epiphanius of Cyprus and the monks of Bethlehem.⁵⁴

⁵² Mansi, 2, col. 672. Cf. S. Vailhé, "Formation du patriarcat de Jérusalem," *Echos d'Orient*, 13 (1910), pp. 325-336.

⁵³ *Hist. eccles.*, 2, 1; *PG*, 20, col. 136; ed. E. Schwartz, p. 104. Cf. K. Lübeck, *op. cit.*, pp. 157 seq.

⁵⁴ S. Hieronymus, *Liber ad Pammachium contra Joannem Hierosolymitanum* chap. 37, *PL*, 23, col. 407A: *Tu qui regulas quaeris ecclesiasticas, et Nicaeni concilii canonibus uteris, et alienos clericos, et cum suis episcopis commorantes*

CHURCH ORGANIZATION

Jerome rebuked John of Jerusalem very severely, and from his outburst it may be concluded that the sixth canon of Nicaea was interpreted as having introduced the status of supra-metropolitan into Church organization. Jerome invokes ecclesiastical rules and uses the canons of the Council of Nicaea when he writes "You, who try to usurp foreign clerics who are in communion with their own bishop, answer me—what has Palestine to do with the Bishop of Alexandria? If I am not mistaken, it is decreed there, that the metropolis of Palestine should be Caesarea, and the metropolis of all the Orient should be Antioch. You should thus apply either to the Bishop of Caesarea . . . or, if you wish to seek another judgment, you should write to Antioch. . . ."

The meaning of Jerome's words is clear. The bishops must first seek the advice or judgment of their metropolitans, and if they are not satisfied, they then have the right of appeal to the supra-metropolitan, but Jerome will not tolerate having a bishop disregard his own metropolitan or supra-metropolitan, and invoke the intervention of the supra-metropolitan of another diocese, and he speaks of this procedure as of something generally known and accepted, and traces it back to the canons of Nicaea.

Canon six of the Council of Nicaea also acknowledges the rights of the Roman see over the whole of Italy, and suggests, moreover, that the exercise of these rights by the bishop of Rome was a precedent that served as a good example for the bishop of Alexandria.⁵⁵

tibi niteris usurpare, responde mihi, ad Alexandrinum episcopum Palaestina quid pertinet? Ni fallor, hoc ibi decernitur, ut Palaestinae metropolis Caesaria sit, et totius Orientis Antiochia. Aut igitur ad Caesariensem episcopum referre debueras, cui, sprete communione tua, communicare nos noveras; aut si procul expetendum iudicium erat, Antiochiam potius litterae dirigendae. Sed novi cur Caesariam, cur Antiochiam nolueris mittere. Sciebas quid fugeres, quid vitares. Maluisti occupatis auribus molestiam facere, quam debitum metropolitanis tuo honorem reddere.

⁵⁵ G. Roethe ("Zur Geschichte der röm. Synoden im 3. und 4. Jahrhundert," in *Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Geistesgesch.*, II [*Geistige Grundlagen röm. Kirchenpolitik*, Stuttgart, 1932], p. 7) is inclined to think the first known bishop of Alexandria (about 187–230), when instituting bishops in Egyptian localities, simply imitated a practice introduced in Rome by his contemporary, Pope Victor. Cf. also G. La Piana, "The Roman Church at the End of the Second Century," *Harvard Theological Review*, 18 (1925), p. 233.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

Although the idea of apostolicity was cultivated in Rome from the very beginning of its Christian history, and although it enhanced the prestige of the bishops as successors of St. Peter, the fact that the political situation existing in Italy also helped considerably to foster their influence and prestige should not be overlooked. The inhabitants of Italy were Roman citizens of the last period of the Republic, and Italian towns were Roman *municipia*. What, therefore, could have been more natural for the Christians of the Italian towns than that they should regard themselves as members of the Christian community of Rome? It is no wonder that the bishop of Rome was the metropolitan of the hundred bishops who existed in Italy about the year 250.

But again, it was the practice of adaptation to the political structure of the Empire that brought about the limitation of the rights of Roman bishops. Under Maximian Milan became an imperial residence, and thus rose to great prominence. As a consequence of Diocletian's administrative reforms, the city became the capital of the diocese of Italy (*Italia Annonaria*), a development which was confirmed by Constantine the Great in 323. No direct indication is extant as to when the bishop of Milan assumed jurisdiction over the North of Italy, but it must certainly have happened before St. Ambrose became Bishop of Milan, and it is safe to suppose that it happened when the administrative changes took place.⁵⁶

From that time on, the bishop of Milan obtained jurisdiction over the provinces administered by the *vicarius Italiae*,⁵⁷—Liguria, Emilia, Venetia, and Flaminia. The direct jurisdiction of the Roman bishop was, thenceforward, limited to the provinces called *suburbicariae*⁵⁸ placed under the *vicarius Urbis*—Toscana,

⁵⁶ Cf. F. Lanzoni, "Le diocesi d'Italia dalle origini al principio del secolo VII (an. 604)," *Studi e Testi*, 35 (1927), pp. 1016 seq. "S'inclina a credere che la chiesa di Milano entrasse in possesso di questo diritto allorchè divenne capitale effettiva dell' impero e residenza ordinaria dell' imperatore Massimiano, e quando, nel 297, Diocleziano divise l'Italia in due diocesi cioè nella diocesi di Roma e nella diocesi di Milano; divisione confermata da Costantino nel 323." Cf. also F. Savio, *Gli antichi vescovi d'Italia, dalle origini al 1300 descritti per regioni*, 1 (Florence, 1913), La Lombardia, Milano, pp. 104–108.

⁵⁷ Cf. P. Batiffol, *Cathedra Petri, études d'histoire ancienne de l'Eglise* (Paris, 1938), p. 43.

⁵⁸ This interpretation of the sixth Nicene canon is to be found in later Latin translations. See C. H. Turner, *op. cit.*, 1, pp. 120 (Caecilianus), 121 (interpret. Prisca), 150, 197 (Rufinus).

CHURCH ORGANIZATION

Ombria, Campania, Lucania-Bruttium, Apulia-Calabria, Samnium, Flaminia-Picenum, Valeria, Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica.

There is no trace of a protest by the bishop of Rome against this partition, and apparently Rome did nothing to hasten the creation of further metropolitan sees in northern Italy—Aquileia and Ravenna⁵⁹—in order to diminish a possible danger from the great metropolis of Milan. The new situation was accepted because it fostered the propagation of the faith in northern Italy, and because it corresponded to the established practice of adapting the ecclesiastical to the political division of the Empire.

Another case which may be cited was the effort of the bishops of Rome to adapt themselves, at least partially, to a new situation in civil administration. In 379 the Emperor Gratian⁶⁰ detached two dioceses, Macedonia and Dacia, which formed the eastern part of Illyricum, from his part of the Empire, and ceded them to the Emperor Theodosius. This measure was only provisional, because in 380 the eastern part of Illyricum was already reunited with the western part, and so again formed a part of the Empire of the West. A period of fluctuation followed from 380 to 395 during which Illyricum was more often governed by the Emperor of the East than by the Emperor of the West, but in 395 the division of Illyricum into an eastern part, comprising the dioceses of Macedonia and Dacia, and a western part, comprising the dioceses of Pannonia and Rhaetia, became definitive.⁶¹

This splitting up endangered the maintenance of papal juris-

⁵⁹ On the promotion of Aquileia (about 400) and Ravenna (between 426 and 431) to a metropolitan status, see F. Savio, *op. cit.*, pp. 152, 168, 179.

⁶⁰ Sozomenos, *Hist. eccles.*, 7, 4; PG, 67, col. 1421.

⁶¹ See, on this complicated history, E. Stein, "Untersuchungen zur spät-römischen Verwaltungsgeschichte," *Rheinisches Museum*, 74 (1925), pp. 347 seq.; E. Demougeot, "A propos des partages de l'Illyricum en 386-395," *Actes du VI^e congrès international d'études byzantines*, I (Paris, 1950), pp. 87-92; Cf. also her work, *De l'unité à la division de l'empire romain* (Paris, 1951), pp. 143 seq. J. R. Palanque, "La préfecture du Prétoire de l'Illyricum au IV^e siècle," *Byzantion*, 21 (1951), pp. 5-14. Numerous bibliographical notices will be found in the detailed but less clear study by V. Grumel, "L'Illyricum de la mort de Valentinien I^{er} (375) à la mort de Stilicon (408)," *Revue des études byzantines*, 9 (1951), pp. 5-46. The most complete bibliography on Illyricum will be found in M. V. Anastos' study "The Transfer of Illyricum to the Jurisdiction of the Patriarchate of Constantinople in 732-733," "*Silloge Bizantina*" in *onore di Silvio Giuseppe Mercati* (Rome, 1957), pp. 15, 16.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

diction over the whole of Illyricum,—a danger which was accentuated by the rise of Constantinople—and this development was further illustrated by the decisions in its favor made by the Council of Constantinople in 381. In order to avert the danger, the Roman bishops felt obliged to create a new ecclesiastical dignity—a vicar of the Roman see; so the dioceses of Macedonia and Dacia were placed under the surveillance of this vicar, who was the metropolitan of Thessalonica, the city which was the residence of the *praefectus praetorio Illyrici*.

The establishment of the vicariate of Thessalonica seems to have gone through an evolution similar to that of the political situation in Illyricum. A letter of Pope Innocent I⁶² shows that the new vicariate was instituted by Damasus (336–384), possibly in 379, when the changes in Illyricum began. But, doubtless because of the unstable political situation in that part of the Empire, the vicariate seems to have become secure only under Damasus' successor Siricius (384–398). Pope Leo's letter to Anastasius of Thessalonica⁶³ shows that Siricius delegated special powers to Anysius, Anastasius' predecessor. This could be interpreted as a confirmation of Damasus' initiative, but the problem needs more thorough examination.

Pope Innocent I (402–417), when writing to Anysius of Thessalonica about his elevation to the see of Rome, declared⁶⁴ that he followed the example of his predecessors Damasus, Siricius, and Anastasius, who were in the habit of communicating to the bishop of Thessalonica all important events in Rome. This letter shows, at least, that the bishops of Thessalonica were regarded as the most prominent prelates in Illyricum, with whom the bishops of Rome, from Damasus on, had entered into an especially intimate relationship.

⁶² Letter to Anysius of Thessalonica, Mansi, 8, col. 750, *PL*, 20, cols. 463 ff.

⁶³ *PL*, 54, *Epist.* 6, col. 617.

⁶⁴ Mansi, 8 cols. 750 seq. The letters concerning the rights of Thessalonica over Illyricum, the so-called *Collectio Thessalonicensis*, are preserved in the *Acts of the Roman Synod of 531*, and were published, in 1662, by Holstes. E. Schwartz, in his study "Die sogenannte Sammlung der Kirche von Thessalonich" (*Festschrift für R. Reitzenstein* [Leipzig, Berlin, 1931], pp. 137–159), corrected the many mistakes of Holstes' edition reprinted in Mansi. Schwartz's remarks are of great importance for the study of the position of Thessalonica in Illyricum. Another edition of the Collection was made by C. v. Silva-Tarouca in *Textus et Documenta, series theologica*, 23 (Rome. 1937).

CHURCH ORGANIZATION

A letter of Siricius (384–398) to Anysius⁶⁵ gives us, fortunately, more explicit details about this kind of relationship. The Pope, in order to prevent irregularities in elevations of bishops in Illyricum, repeated what he had already made known to Siricius in another letter: that no-one would be permitted to ordain a bishop in Illyricum without the consent of the bishop of Thessalonica.

In a letter to Anysius' successor, Rufus, Innocent discussed more specifically the position of the bishop of Thessalonica in Illyricum, whom he designated expressly as vicar of the Pope, and enumerated the provinces that were placed under the bishop's jurisdiction. They corresponded to the provinces of the two dioceses—Macedonia (Achaëa, Thessalia, Epirus Vetus, Epirus Nova, Crete) and Dacia (Dacia Mediterranea, Dacia Ripensis, Moesia, Dardania, Praevalitana). The rights accorded by the Pope to his vicar were considerable. The vicar was to represent the Pope in Eastern Illyricum, to confirm the elections of bishops and to consecrate them, to preside over the local synod of the whole territory, and to act as judge in all difficulties that might arise among the bishops of his vicariate. Only major cases or appeals against the vicar's decisions were reserved to the Pope's judgment.

The Pope explicitly pointed out that he was not introducing anything new into the relationship between Rome and Thessalonica, but that he was continuing the practice of his predecessors, who had given such rights to Acholius and Anysius.⁶⁶ All of this permits us to assume that Pope Damasus must already have conceived the idea of giving to the bishops of Thessalonica a privileged position in Illyricum. The *terminus a quo* of Damasus' initiative could have been the year 379 when the changes in Illyricum had started. Actually Damasus was in continuous contact with Acholius of Thessalonica, who acted, as the Pope's trustee in Constantinople, against both the candidature of the Philosopher Maximus to the bishopric of that city, and against the candidature of Gregory of

⁶⁵ Mansi, 8, col. 751.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, cols. 751 seq.: *non primitus haec ita statuentes sed praecessores nostros apostolicos imitati qui beatissimis Acholio et Anysio injungi pro eorum meritis ita voluerant Arripe itaque, dilectissime frater, nostra vice per superscriptas ecclesias, salvo eorum primatu, curam*

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

Nazianzus.⁶⁷ Unfortunately we have no other documentary evidence concerning Damasus' plans for Illyricum, but we have no reason to doubt Innocent's repeated statements that his predecessors—Damasus is also expressly mentioned—had already conferred rights, similar to those he had so fully specified in 415 in his letter to Rufus, on the bishops of Thessalonica.⁶⁸

The letter of Siricius to Anysius reveals the second phase of the growth of an idea which was only vaguely conceived by Damasus. The fluctuating political status of Illyricum from 380 to 395 may have induced Siricius to strengthen, with the help of the Bishop of Thessalonica, the bonds tying Illyricum to Rome. The letter may be taken as an indication that Anysius, discharging the function which Damasus had entrusted to him, had complained to the Pope about irregularities that had occurred recently in Illyricum. In order to prevent a repetition of these, the metropolitan of Thessalonica was charged in future to supervise personally, or by delegating another bishop, all episcopal elections in Eastern Illyricum, so that they might be carried out according to the statutes of the Nicene Council and of the Roman Church. It can be assumed that the disorders in question were, at least in part, a consequence of the unstable political conditions in Eastern Illyricum.

Innocent's letter quoted above reveals that the privilege given by Siricius to the metropolitan of Thessalonica was confirmed by Siricius' successor Anastasius (398–402). The establishment of a vicariate in Thessalonica was a very prudent move, and, by thus accomodating themselves to the new administrative change, the Popes preserved their jurisdiction over Illyricum for a long time to come.

⁶⁷ Mansi, 8, col. 750. Cf. E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, I (Tübingen, 1930), pp. 235 seq.

⁶⁸ H. Fuhrmann, in his study "Studien zur Geschichte mittelalterlicher Patriarchate," *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung*, 70, *Kanon. Abt.*, 39 (1953), p. 173, is too rigid when he dated the establishment of the vicariate from only 415. Cf. also J. Haller, *Das Papsttum*, I (2nd ed., Stuttgart, 1950), pp. 511–514. However, it should be admitted that the idea of the vicariat grew slowly under Damasus, Siricius and Anastasius, and found its full development only under Innocent. J. Langen (*Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, I, *bis zum Pontifikate Leos I* [Bonn, 1881], p. 668) admitted that Anastasius might already have given to the bishop of Thessalonica the privilege of being supreme judge in Illyricum. According to Langen, Innocent went too far when he dated the establishment of the vicariate from Damasus in order to create an older tradition.

CHURCH ORGANIZATION

When, in 421, the Emperor Theodosius II⁶⁹ attempted to bring Illyricum under the bishop of Constantinople, Pope Boniface (418–422) asked the Emperor of the West, Honorius, to help him defend the rights of the Roman Church. Honorius sent a letter to Theodosius II,⁷⁰ and this document marks, for the first time in the history of the Roman see, the invocation by Boniface of canon six of the Council of Nicaea to protect his rights. Honorius likewise stressed the prominent position of Rome in the Empire, and appealed to Theodosius II not to permit “the Roman Church to lose under Christian emperors what it had not lost under other rulers.”

Theodosius II promptly acceded to Honorius' request. His letter⁷¹ shows that he had acted on suggestions made by some Illyrian bishops. But, after receiving Honorius' letter, he immediately informed the *praefectus praetorio Illyrici* that his rescript should not be put into practice. Boniface then solemnly confirmed the dignity of a vicar to Rufus, Metropolitan of Thessalonica, and in his letters to the bishops of Thessaly and all Eastern Illyricum he once more reiterated very outspokenly the rights of the see of Peter in Illyricum.⁷²

⁶⁹ P. Coustant, *Epist. Rom. Pontificum* I, col. 1029. *Cod. Theod.*, 16, 2, 45; ed. P. Krueger, Th. E. Mommsen p. 852. *PL*, 20, col. 769.

⁷⁰ P. Coustant, *ibid.*, cols. 1029, 1030: *Omnibus quidem causis, in quibus nostrum postulatur auxilium, intercessionem apud aures tuae clementiae negare non possumus; sed his majorem necessario curam studiumque debemus quibus sanctae sedis apostolicae desideria continentur. Nam cum favore divino nostrum semper gubernetur imperium, procul dubio ilius urbis ecclesia speciali nobis cultu veneranda est, ex qua et Romanum principatum accepimus, et principium sacerdotium Petit enim, ut haec privilegia, quae dudum a patribus constituta usque ad tempora nostra servata, inconcussa perdurent. In qua parte respicit serenitas tua, nihil vetustis decretis, si quae canonum conscripta sunt regulis, penitus derogandum* See also *PL*, 20, cols. 769 seq.

⁷¹ P. Coustant, *ibid.*, cols. 1030, 1031. *PL*, 20, cols. 770 seq.

⁷² P. Coustant, *ibid.*, cols. 1034 seq. *PL*, 20, *Epist.* 13, 14, 15, cols. 774–784. See also the whole papal correspondence concerning Illyricum in Mansi, 8, cols. 749 seq., in the *Acts of the Roman Council from 531*. For details see P. Batiffol, *Le siège apostolique* (Paris, 1924), pp. 245–265. J. Zeiller, *Les origines chrétiennes dans les provinces danubiennes de l'Empire romain* (Paris 1918), pp. 365 seq. Cf. also F. Dvornik, *Les légendes de Constantin et de Méthode vues de Byzance* (Prague, 1933), pp. 248 seq. Recently R. Honig, *Beitrag zur Entwicklung des Kirchenrechts* (Göttinger Rechtswissenschaftliche Studien, Heft 12 [1954]), pp. 30–45, declared that Theodosius' letters to Honorius and the three letters by Boniface (*PL*, 20, cols. 774–786, *Epist.* 12, 14, 15) had been interpolated after the year 534, and dated the erection of the Illyrian vicariate no earlier than 535 after the promotion of *Justiniana prima* to an archbishopric by Justinian I. Thus Honig renewed the objections

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

In the western provinces outside Italy also the tradition of conforming to the political division of the Empire was applied, although sometimes only in a general way.

Africa was divided under Diocletian into nine provinces which were attached to three dioceses. Libya superior and Libya inferior formed a part of the diocese of Egypt, and Mauretania Tingitana that of the diocese of Spain. The diocese of Africa comprised the provinces of Tripolitana, Valeria Byzacena, Proconsularis Zeugitana, Numidia Curtensis, Mauretania Sitifensis, and Mauretania Caesariensis. This new division finally replaced the old administrative partition of three provinces: Africa proconsularis, comprising the Tripolitana and the Byzacena, Numidia, and Mauretania.⁷³ Carthage, in frequent contact with Rome, the administrative and religious center of the Empire, exercised, from the beginning, an irresistible attraction for all Christian communities in Africa. St. Cyprian, with his genius for organization, firmly established the supremacy of his see over the whole of third-century Africa. In one of his letters he declares openly that from the ecclesiastical point of view there was only one province in Africa, uniting all three administrative units.⁷⁴

to the authenticity of the documents raised by Friedrich in his study, "Über die Sammlung der Kirche in Thessalonich und das päpstliche Vikariat für Illyricum," *Sitzungsber. Philos. Phil.-hist. Kl. der Akademie* (Munich, 1891), pp. 771 seq. Friedrich's objections were refuted by L. Duchesne in his study "L'Illyricum ecclésiastique," *BZ*, 1 (1892), pp. 531-550, and by Leporski in *Istorija Fessaalonikskago ekzarchata* (St. Petersburg, 1901), which I am unable to obtain. Duchesne's argument was approved by J. Haller also (*Das Papsttum*, op. cit., p. 511), and is still generally accepted. Honig goes further than Friedrich in thinking that Illyricum was an independent Church unit; a kind of patriarchate directing its own affairs through its own councils. Theodosius' decree confirmed this status for Illyricum and stipulated only that the patriarch of Constantinople should be consulted before a conciliar decision was made. Honig's interpretation of the decree, contrary to opinions held until now, excludes any possibility of a submission by Illyricum to Constantinople. According to him, also, the papal letters concerning Illyricum, written before 535, which he regards as genuine, respect the autonomous status of Illyricum in conformity to Theodosius' decree. This interesting, though too bold, interpretation, does not seem sufficiently substantiated. In any case, even Honig's interpretation confirms the general principle revealed here, namely, that until the sixth century the popes respected the political division of the Empire, and adapted their ecclesiastical policies to it.

⁷³ For details see K. J. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, 1 (2nd ed., Leipzig, 1881), pp. 464-488.

⁷⁴ Cyprianus, *Epist.* 48, *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum*, 3, ed. G. Hartel, 1, p. 607, *PL*, 3, cols. 732 seq.

CHURCH ORGANIZATION

The predominant position of Carthage remained untouched even after the new administrative division was introduced by Diocletian. Toward the end of the fourth century the adaptation of the African Church to the new political status was completed, and the metropolitans of the six provinces of the African diocese resided in the provincial capitals; the metropolitan of Africa proconsularis in Carthage, of Valeria Byzacena in Hadrametum, of Numidia in Cirta, of Tripolitana in Tripolis, of Mauretania Sitifensis in Setif, of Mauretania Caesariensis in Caesarea. Only Mauretania Tingitana was not attached ecclesiastically to the diocese of Spain, to which it belonged politically, but remained attached to Mauretania Caesariensis.⁷⁵

In one respect, however, the Church organization of Africa differed from that of the other Churches. The bishops of the provinces together formed a synodal unity, but when they convened in synods the chairmanship was reserved not to the bishops of the provincial capitals, but to the oldest bishops. The provincial assemblies were, however, very much overshadowed by the universal synods of the whole African Church, which were convoked and directed by the bishop of Carthage. Although his jurisdiction over the entire African Church was absolute, extending over all bishoprics, he had to content himself with the modest title of *primae sedis episcopus*.⁷⁶

Although in constant contact with Rome, the Church of Africa spiritedly defended its autonomous status, as shown by Cyprian's attitude regarding the question of the Christians who during Decius' persecution had denied their faith, and particularly by the decision of the African Synod of 418 forbidding any appeal to

⁷⁵ A. Schwartz, "Nordafrikanische Kirche," in Herzog-Hauck *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie u. Kirche*, 14 (3rd ed., 1904), pp. 160 seq. H. Leclercq, *L'Afrique chrétienne*, 1 (Paris, 1904), pp. 63 seq. H. Leclercq, "Afrique," in F. Cabrol, *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne*, 1 (Paris, 1904), cols. 576-775. L. Duchesne, *op. cit.*, pp. 17 seq. *Idem.*, *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise*, 1 (3rd ed., Paris, 1923), pp. 388-452. G. Metzger, *Die Afrikanische Kirche* (Dissertation, Tübingen, 1934). E. Buonaiuti, *Il Cristianesimo nell'Africa* (Bari, 1928). R. Höslinger, *Die alte afrikanische Kirche* (Vienna, 1935). Cf. also F. Heiler, *Altkirchliche Autonomie und päpstlicher Zentralismus* (Munich, 1941), pp. 3-51.

⁷⁶ Mansi, 3, col. 884 (canon 26 of the third Carthaginian synod).

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

Rome from the judgment of African bishops,⁷⁷ a canon which was strongly reaffirmed in a synodal letter of 426 in which the Council of Carthage forbade any further Roman intervention in African ecclesiastical matters.⁷⁸ In this the Church of Africa had adopted an attitude similar to that of the Eastern Churches; indeed, it went even further than did the Eastern Fathers, for we can find in the decisions of eastern synods hardly a canon to match that which was voted in 418 by the Synod of Carthage.

Cyprian's letters not only give us very useful information on the growth of the ecclesiastical organization of Africa, but also show that in their synods the African prelates imitated the procedure governing the meetings of the Roman Senate,⁷⁹ thus providing another instance of the extent to which the Church adapted itself to Roman political divisions and customs.

Spain was divided, beginning with the time of Augustus, into three provinces: Tarraconensis, in the north and northwest parts of the peninsula, Lusitania, roughly modern Portugal, and Boëtica in the south. Two more provinces were formed in the imperial period from the territory of Tarraconensis: Carthageniensis and Gallaecia.⁸⁰ There is no reason to suppose that the ecclesiastical organization of Spain did not follow the administrative division of the peninsula. At least, at the synod of Elvira (Illiberis-Granada), which was held soon after 300, all five provinces were represented by their bishops.⁸¹ The creation of metropolitan sees in Spain seems, however, to have come about more slowly than in other parts of the Empire. The famous fifty-eighth canon voted by the synod of Elvira is generally invoked as a proof that the metropolitan organization had by then already been introduced into the Church of Spain. The canon orders a strict inspection of letters of recommen-

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, col. 822 (canon 125).

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 4, cols. 515 seq. E. Caspar (*op. cit.*, p. 372) calls this letter to Pope Celestin "der Schwanengesang und ein testamentarisches Vermächtnis der cyprianischen Kirchenidee von der *unitas ecclesiae* an spätere geistige Strömungen im Schosse der Kirche, welche den 'Episkopalismus' gegen den 'Papalismus' auf den Schild zu heben versuchten."

⁷⁹ See F. Dvornik, "Emperors, Popes, and General Councils," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 6 (Cambridge, Mass., 1951), pp. 1-23.

⁸⁰ K. J. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, I, pp. 251-260.

⁸¹ Mansi, 2, cols. 2-20.

CHURCH ORGANIZATION

dation presented by peregrinating Christians, "in all places, and especially where the first see of the bishopric is erected."⁸²

The wording of the canon is, however, not clear enough to permit, with certainty, this interpretation, because, in addition to nineteen bishops present at the synod, twenty-four priests attended and signed the Acts, and the words *ubique et maxime eo loco, in quo prima cathedra constituta est episcopatus* could, therefore, have been addressed to the priests and to the bishop of the dioceses.⁸³ The letters of recommendation should be examined carefully wherever a priest is established, but especially wherever a bishop resides. In this instance we can invoke this canon only as proof that at least the diocesan organization was well established in Spain about the year 300.

The fact that Bishop Felix of Acci (Quadix) was the first to sign the Acts seems to indicate that the Church of Spain followed the example of the Church of Africa, with which it kept in constant touch, in assigning first place to the oldest bishop of the provinces.⁸⁴ Thus, at least, did the Spanish ecclesiastical organization evolve. In the fourth century the Church of Spain had a firm metropolitan organization, and in each metropolis the oldest bishop held the primacy.⁸⁵ All metropolitans, however, were subject to the metro-

⁸² *Ibid.*, col. 15: *De his, qui communicatorias literas portant, ut de fide interrogentur. Placuit ubique et maxime in eo loco, in quo prima cathedra constituta est episcopatus, ut interrogentur hi qui communicatorias literas tradunt, an omnia recte habeant suo testimonio comprobata.* On the synod cf. C. J. Hefele, H. Leclercq, *Hist. des Conciles*, 1, pt. 1, pp. 212-264. See also, H. Leclercq, *L'Espagne chrétienne* (Paris, 1906), pp. 59-77, and Zacharias Garcia Villada, *Historia ecclesiastica de España*, 1, pt. 1 (Madrid, 1929), pp. 301-325.

⁸³ Cf. A. Eitel, "Die spanische Kirche in vorgermanischer Zeit," *Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiete der mittleren und neueren Geschichte und ihrer Hilfswissenschaften. Eine Festgabe zum 70. Geburtstag Prof. H. Finke* (Münster i.W., 1925), p. 5, fn. 7. P. Batiffol, in his *Cathedra Petri* (Paris, 1938), pp. 105-121, thinks that the *prima cathedra episcopatus* is the see of Rome. This interpretation cannot, however, be accepted. The synod dealt exclusively with matters concerning Spanish affairs.

⁸⁴ P. B. Gams (*Die Kirchengeschichte Spaniens*, 2, pt. 1 [Regensburg, 1864-1876], pp. 173-189) tried to show that the bishops signed according to the dates of the founding of their bishoprics. The bishopric of Acci was the oldest in Spain.

⁸⁵ Cf. F. Heiler, *op. cit.*, pp. 51 seq. Garcia Villada, *op. cit.*, pp. 195-213.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

politan of Tarragona,⁸⁶ the capital of the greatest province of Spain. The five metropolises (Tarragona, Sevilla, Toledo, Braga, Merida) were established in the prominent cities of the five provinces, in complete accommodation to the political division of the country.⁸⁷

This situation was further consolidated when, under King Rekkared (586–601), the old Latin Church of Spain was united with the National Church of the new rulers—the Visigoths—who had abandoned the Arian Creed. The authority of the metropolitans was thus even further strengthened. They were the highest judges in the ecclesiastical affairs of the provinces, and presided at the provincial synods, but the supreme authority for the whole Church of Spain rested in the national synods of all the bishops, convoked by the king and directed by the metropolitan of Toledo, then the capital of the kingdom.⁸⁸

It should be noted that the idea of apostolicity had not played a prominent role in the ecclesiastical organization of Africa and Spain in spite of the fact that both countries derived their Christianity from apostolic times. Roman missionaries must have been quite active in Africa at a very early period, and, although Pope Innocent I seems to have attributed the christianization of Carthage to Rome alone,⁸⁹ it is now agreed that Christianity had penetrated into Carthage and into northern Africa generally, directly from Asia, before the Roman missionaries started their work there.⁹⁰ This may have given birth to local popular tales attributing the origin of African christianity to St. Peter and his disciple Crescen-

⁸⁶ S. Himerius, Bishop of Tarragona, seems to have acted as Spain's primate when addressing to Pope Damasus a letter on the religious situation in Spain. The letter was answered by Damasus' successor Siricius (*PL*, 13, cols. 1131–1147).

⁸⁷ Only Toledo was not also the administrative capital of its province, the Carthageniensis. The promotion of this city to a metropolis shows that the strategical and geographical position of Toledo gave it pre-eminence over Valencia in every respect.

⁸⁸ Garcia Villada, *op. cit.*, 2, pt. 1, pp. 17–43, 79–130. Cf. also A. K. Ziegler, *Church and State in Visigothic Spain* (Washington, 1930), and E. Magnin, *L'Eglise visigothique au VII^e siècle* (Paris, 1912).

⁸⁹ Innocentius, *Epistolae*, *PL*, 20, *Epist.* 25, 2, col. 552.

⁹⁰ Cf. P. Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne*, 1 (Paris, 1901), pp. 4 seq. and R. Höslinger, *op. cit.*, pp. 10 seq. On the penetration of Christianity into Africa in apostolic times see P. J. Mesnage, *Le Christianisme en Afrique, origines, développements, extension* (Paris, 1914), pp. 2 seq., 58–79.

CHURCH ORGANIZATION

tius (allegedly ordained Bishop of Carthage by Peter),⁹¹ or to Simon the Cananean and Jude,⁹² or to St. Mark.⁹³

These tales must have started to circulate quite early, although Tertullian and Cyprian appear not to have known them. From a letter of Pope Gregory the Great we learn, however, that the bishops of Numidia asked him for permission to retain the customs and traditions which had endured in Africa from the time that the Apostle Peter had preached there.⁹⁴ In the fifth century the belief that Peter had evangelized Carthage seems to have been widespread. This is attested by Salvian⁹⁵ and, to a certain extent, by Augustine, although the latter is rather vague and seems to link the origins of African Christianity only very generally to the apostolic age.⁹⁶ Thus this legend⁹⁷ did not become widely accepted in Africa until later, when the Church organization, based on the political division of the country, had been completely realized. The invasion of the Vandals had brought to a halt in Africa any further development of the apostolic tradition.

Spain can also claim the honor of having been evangelized by the Apostle Paul, who, according to the testimony of St. Clement (I Ep. 5) and the Canon of Muratori,⁹⁸ had been able to carry out

⁹¹ *Anonymus Graecus De SS. Petro et Paulo*, chap. 3, *Acta Sanctorum* (June 29), 3^d ed., 7, p. 379. L. N. de Tillemont (*Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique*, 1 [Paris, 1693-1738], pp. 548 seq.) has already shown the legendary character of this tradition. Flavius Lucius Dexter Barcinonensis, *Chronicon omnimodae historiae*, PL, 31, col. 163, *ad an.* 50.

⁹² Nicephorus Callistas Xanthopoulos, *Historia ecclesiastica*, bk. 2, chap. 40; PG, 145, col. 864.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, bk. 2, chap. 43, col. 876.

⁹⁴ Gregorius Magnus, *Epistolae*, 1, *Epist.* 77, PL, 77, col. 531.

⁹⁵ Salvianus, *De gubernatione Dei*, 7, chap. 18, PL, 53, col. 146; CSEL, 8, ed. F. Pauly, no. 79, p. 181, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Auctores Antiquissimi*, 1, ed. K. Halm, col. 98.

⁹⁶ S. Augustinus Hipponensis, *De Unitate Ecclesiae*, chap. 15, no. 37, PL, 43, col. 419 *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, 49:3, PL, 36, col. 566. *Gesta Collationis Carthaginense habitae inter Catholicas et Donatistas Cognit.* 3, 230, Mansi, 4, col. 229. *Enarr. in Ps.* 44:23, PL, *ibid.*, col. 508. *Epist.* 43, chap. 7, PL, 33, col. 163; CSEL, 34, ed. A. Goldbacher, p. 90.

⁹⁷ P. J. Mesnage (*op. cit.*, pp. 43-79) accepted this tradition. It was, however, disproved by J. Gagé, "Nouveaux aspects de l'Afrique chrétienne," *Annales de l'Ecole des Hautes Études de Gand*, 1 (1937), pp. 183-188, and by J. Ferron and G. Lapeyre ("Carthage," in *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique*, 11 [1939], cols. 1178 seq.).

⁹⁸ Lines 38 seq. G. Kuhn, *Das muratorische Fragment über die Bücher des Neuen Testaments* (Zürich, 1892), p. 12. E. Dubowy, "Klemens von Rom über die Reise Pauli nach Spanien," *Biblische Studien*, 19 (1914). More recently,

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

his plan, revealed in his letter to the Romans (chap. 15: 24-28), to visit Spain. The tradition of the activity of the Apostle James in Spain is legendary, and started to spread only in the seventh century. Another tradition—that Spain was evangelized by seven disciples of the apostles—cannot be altogether rejected.⁹⁹ In spite of all these connections of Spanish Christianity to apostolic times, the idea of apostolicity played such a minor role in the organization of the early Spanish Church that even the activity of St. Paul in that country cannot be ascertained through any local documentary evidence.

In Gaul there are no traces of a metropolitan organization before the fourth century, for the bishop of Rome stood at the head of the hierarchy. He owed his dominant position in Gaul, and in the West generally, not only to the prestige of St. Peter, the first of the apostles, whose successor he was, but also to the fact that Rome was the capital of the Empire.¹⁰⁰

Lyons enjoyed prominence in Gaul for some time, owing to the prestige of its Bishop St. Irenaeus. Arles, however, became important when Constantine the Great chose it as his residence and it claimed the honor of being a metropolis, though before that it had been a simple provincial city. When, however, after 392, the prefect of the diocese of Gallia had to abandon his residence at Trèves, and take refuge in Arles, the bishops of that city started to extend their jurisdiction over the bishops of three provinces: Viennensis, Narbonensis Prima and Secunda. These encroachments provoked sharp protests from the bishops of Vienne, the capital of the civil province of Viennensis.

The synod of Turin,¹⁰¹ which attempted in its second canon to however, K. Heussi (*Die römische Petrustradition in kritischer Sicht* [Tübingen, 1955], pp. 62-68) rejects this interpretation of Clement's word. According to him Clement had in mind not Spain, but Rome.

⁹⁹ All documentary evidence on the legendary preaching of St. James in Spain and the activity of the "seven men" in that country is to be found in Garcia Villada's *Hist. eccles. de España*, I, pt. I, pp. 27-104, 147-168.

¹⁰⁰ However, after Milan became a metropolitan see, the bishops of Gaul, when in difficulty, addressed themselves to its bishop. Cf. L. Duchesne, *Origines*, pp. 32 seq., 84-89.

¹⁰¹ Mansi, 3, cols. 860 seq. See the voluminous bibliography concerning the dating of this synod, and its importance, in C. J. Hefele, H. Leclercq, *op. cit.*, 2, pt. I, pp. 129-133, 134 (bibliography on canon two).

CHURCH ORGANIZATION

settle this rivalry, declared officially that the principle of adaptation to the civil organization should prevail also in Gaul, and that the bishop who proved his city to be the metropolis of a province, should be recognized as first bishop of the whole province. In spite of this decision, Arles retained its position, and Pope Zosimus I (417-418), in confirming its privileges over the province of Vienne and both provinces of Narbonensis, made its metropolitans special representatives of Rome in Gallia.¹⁰²

Pope Boniface I (418-422), however, did not support the pretensions of Arles, and in his letter to Hilarius of Narbonne he disapproved of an ordination made by the Bishop of Arles in the province of Narbonne. This same letter contains also Boniface's interpretation of canon four, voted by the Council of Nicaea, to the effect that in each province there should be only one metropolitan.¹⁰³

The conflict between Arles and Vienne flared up anew under the reign of Pope Leo the Great (404-461). Hilarius of Arles was deprived of his metropolitan dignity because he used his power without discretion.¹⁰⁴ After his death the bishops of Arles, by quoting the legendary tradition that the first bishop of Arles—Trophimus—was ordained by St. Peter, claimed that the see of Arles should exercise the same principate over all Gaul as the see of Rome, founded by St. Peter, exercised over the whole Church.¹⁰⁵

This request and its wording betray a curious blending of two ideas; the adaptation of ecclesiastical to political organization, and the idea of apostolicity.

Leo the Great found himself in a difficult position. In order to

¹⁰² PL, 20, cols. 642-645, Mansi, 4, cols. 359 seq. Cf. F. Dvornik, *Légendes*, p. 253.

¹⁰³ See *supra*, p. 7.

¹⁰⁴ PL, 54, cols. 628-636.

¹⁰⁵ PL, 54, col. 881: *credentes plenum esse rationis atque justitiae, ut sicut per beatissimum Petrum apostolorum principem sacrosancta Ecclesia Romana teneret supra omnes totius mundi Ecclesias principatum, ita etiam intra Gallias Arelatensis Ecclesia, quae sanctum Trophimum ab apostolis missum sacerdotem habere meruisset, ordinandi pontificium vindicaret.* Cf. P. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, pp. 85 seq. Patroclus' exaggeration concerning Trophimus may, however, rest on some historical basis. It is quite possible that Trophimus was sent by Rome to Arles, though not until the third century. Cf. L. Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*, 1 (2nd ed., Paris, 1907), p. 103, and K. Müller, "Beiträge," *op. cit.*, p. 30.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

settle the quarrel between Vienne and Arles he was forced to disregard Boniface's interpretation of the Nicene decision, and to divide the civil province of Vienne into two metropolitan sees,¹⁰⁶ although no change was effected in the civil administration of the province. He was not willing, however, to recognize explicitly the primacy of Arles in Gaul, although he continued to transmit his messages to the bishops of Gaul through the intermediary of the metropolitan of Arles.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁶ *PL*, 54, cols. 884-885.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, cols. 886 seq. On the primacy of Arles see L. Duchesne, *op. cit.*, 1, chap. 2, pp. 86-146, and H. Leclercq, "Gallicane (Eglise)," *Dict. d'archéol. chrét.*, 6 (Paris, 1929), cols. 395-403, where more bibliographical indications will be found. For more recent bibliography see H. Fuhrmann, "Studien zur Geschichte mittelalterlicher Patriarchate," *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung*, 70, *Kanon. Abt.*, 39 (1953), pp. 147-176.

CHAPTER TWO

THE IDEA OF APOSTOLICITY IN THE WEST AND IN THE EAST BEFORE THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON

Rome the only apostolic see in the West — Apostolic sees in the East — Canon three of the Council of Constantinople (381) viewed in a new light — Reaction in the West — The views of the Council of 382 on apostolicity — St. Basil and the idea of apostolicity — John Chrysostom — Struggle between Alexandria and Constantinople — The principle of apostolicity at the Council of Ephesus — St. Cyril, Dioscorus of Alexandria, and Domnus of Antioch — Leo I's success in stressing the apostolicity of his see in the East — The idea of apostolicity at Chalcedon — Leo I and the so-called twenty-eighth canon — Attitude of the legates — Omission of apostolicity in the canon — Reasons for Leo's negative attitude — Leo's apparent success a disguised compromise.

The short review in chapter one of the development of initial Church organization shows how deeply the principle of adaptation to the political division of the Empire was embedded in the minds of Christian leaders in the fourth century, not only in the East, but in the West and in Rome itself. In this respect, however, one important difference between eastern and western attitudes deserves particular emphasis. As has been shown, the idea of apostolicity played a very limited role in the development of the Church in the eastern provinces, but this was not true of the spread and organization of Christianity in the West. Rome owed its prestige in Italy and in other western provinces not only to the fact that it was, until the first half of the fourth century, the capital of the Empire and the imperial residence, but also to the veneration in which young Christian communities of the West held St. Peter, founder of the Roman see and chief of the apostles, whose successors the Roman bishops claimed to be.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

The problem concerning Peter's stay in Rome is outside the scope of this study,¹ but it should be pointed out that the idea of the Roman bishops' direct succession from the Apostle had to undergo a short period of evolution before it acquired its full meaning. The early Christians regarded the apostles only as universal teachers whom Christ had charged with the mission of spreading his doctrine throughout the world, and were reluctant to designate them as bishops of those cities where they had implanted the Christian faith, or where they had resided.^{1a} The apostles, therefore, were regarded as founders of the Churches in the cities where the Christian seed had taken root, but the series of bishops in those cities started with the names of the disciples appointed by the apostles or by their intimate collaborators. Thus the first known list of Roman bishops given by Irenaeus of Lyon, who is said to have died a martyr's death in 202, designated Peter and Paul as founders of the Church of Rome. Irenaeus' list was as follows:² "The blessed Apostles, after having founded and constructed this Church, entrusted to Linus the function of bishopric . . . He had Anacletus as successor. After him, in third place from the Apostles, the episcopate went to Clement who had seen the blessed apostles. After Clement Evaristus succeeded; after Evaristus, Alexander. Then, in sixth place from the Apostles, Sixtus was installed, and after him Telesphorus, who is famed also for his martyrdom. Afterward Hyginus, Pius, and Anicetus. After

¹ See the review of pertinent literature on this subject in Oscar Cullmann's book *Saint Pierre, disciple, apôtre, martyr, histoire et théologie* (Neufchâtel, Paris, 1952), pp. 61-137. The author discusses the arguments against Peter's having been in Rome which were raised mainly by K. Heussi, and are restated and fully developed by him in his recent brief study *Die römische Petrus-tradition in kritischer Sicht* (Tübingen, 1955). Cullmann concludes that Peter went to Rome toward the end of his life, and there met a martyr's death during Nero's persecutions. Cf. also the review of Cullmann's book by P. Benoit in *Revue biblique*, 60 (1953), pp. 565-579, and M. Goguel, "Le livre d'Oscar Cullmann sur saint Pierre," *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuse*, 35 (1955), pp. 196-209. K. Heussi's arguments were refuted also by K. Aland in his study "Petrus in Rom" (*Historische Zeitschrift*, 183 [1957], pp. 497-516). See J. T. Shotwell, L. R. Loomis, *The See of Peter* (New York, 1927) for documentation of the Petrine tradition.

^{1a} Cf. what O. Cullmann (*op. cit.*, pp. 105 seq.) says on the role of an apostle. Cf. also A. A. T. Ehrhardt, *The Apostolic Succession* (London, 1953), p. 65, footnote 1.

² Irenaeus, *Contra Haereses*, bk. 3, chap. 3, para. 3, *PG*, 7, cols. 849 seq.

APOSTOLICITY BEFORE CHALCEDON

Anicetus Soter succeeded; then Eleutherus who now occupies the episcopal office, in twelfth place from the Apostles."

It is clear from this quotation that the Bishop of Lyon did not count the Apostle Peter among Roman bishops. Moreover, he regarded Paul, along with Peter, as a founder of Roman Christianity. It is still debated among specialists whether or not Irenaeus used here a catalogue of Roman bishops established by Hegesippus.³ If he did, this would be another indication that what he said concerning Peter and Paul was the oldest Roman tradition. Irenaeus' catalogue of Roman bishops seems to have been used by Hippolytus.⁴

In the meantime the idea of the intimate connection of the Roman see with Peter could only have become more and more insistent. This seems apparent in the attitude of Pope Callixtus (217-222) who is the first to quote the famous passage (Matt. 16:18,19) in which Christ declares that he founded his Church in the person of Peter to whom he also gave the power of binding and loosing. Of course we have only Tertullian's testimony for Callixtus' use of this passage,⁵ and since what he says is not clear, it is open to various interpretations.⁶ We may, however, deduce from Tertullian's words that Callixtus, in quoting the passage, did so in the belief that he was Peter's successor.

In spite of this, the old custom of distinguishing the apostles

³ See B. H. Streeter, *The Primitive Church* (London, 1929), pp. 188-195; H. von Campenhausen, "Lehrreihen und Bischofsreihen im 2. Jahrhundert." In *Memoriam Ernst Lohmeyer* (Stuttgart, 1951), p. 247. Cf. also *The Apostolic Fathers*, ed. J. B. Lightfoot, 1, *S. Clement of Rome* (London, 1890), pp. 202 seq., and especially E. Molland, "Le développement de l'idée de succession apostolique," in *Rev. d'hist. et de phil. rel.*, 34 (1954), pp. 20 seq.

⁴ See E. Caspar, "Die älteste römische Bischofsliste" (*Schriften der Königsberger gelehrten Gesellschaft, Geisteswiss. Kl. 4* [1926]), pp. 206 seq., Harnack's and Caspar's reconstruction of Hippolytus' list with bibliographical indications. Eusebius (*Historia ecclesiastica*, 5, 28; *PG*, 20, col. 512; ed. E. Schwartz, p. 500) quotes a short passage from Hippolytus in which the latter calls Victor the thirteenth Bishop, thus not counting Peter as first Bishop. See also what A. A. T. Ehrhardt (*op. cit.*, pp. 35-61) says on the early succession lists.

⁵ *De Pudicitia*, chap. 21, *CSEL*, 20, ed. A. Reifferscheid, G. Wissowa, p. 270.

⁶ See E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, 1 (Tübingen, 1930), pp. 27 seq.; H. Koch, "Cathedra Petri, neue Untersuchungen über die Anfänge der Primatslehre," *Hefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 2 (Giessen, 1930), pp. 5-32; P. Batiffol, *L'Eglise naissante et le catholicisme* (Paris, 1909), pp. 349 seq.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

from the first bishops continued predominant. Tertullian, for example, is quite outspoken in this respect.⁷

Of great interest in this matter is Eusebius' treatment of the question of succession of bishops to the principal sees: Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch. He traces the line of bishops in Rome from Peter and Paul, in Alexandria from St. Mark, and in Antioch from St. Peter, but he does not place the founders of those Churches at the head of his lists of bishops. In Rome the list is headed by Linus, in Alexandria by Annianus, and in Antioch by Euodius.⁸ St. James, the first bishop of Jerusalem, was appointed by the Saviour and the apostles.⁹

Although in his Church History Eusebius is eager to emphasize the theory that the founders of Roman Christianity were St. Peter and St. Paul,¹⁰ he names only Peter in his Chronicle.¹¹ Since the Armenian and Syriac texts of the Chronicle also quote only Peter as founder, we must conclude that Jerome, translator of the Chronicle into Latin, has here rendered faithfully Eusebius' meaning. This indicates that Eusebius was familiar with a tendency that was becoming more and more manifest in Rome; namely, the attribution of the foundation of the see of Rome to Peter alone.

Another list of Roman bishops from the year 354, the so-called *Liberian Catalogue*, is one of the first documents which not only abandons the old tradition attributing the foundation of the Roman see to Peter and Paul, but also minimizes the distinction between apostles and bishops, putting Peter at the head of the list, and omitting Linus as the first bishop after the Apostles.¹²

⁷ *De Praescriptione*, chap. 32, CSEL, 70, ed. E. Kroymann, pp. 39 seq.: *Edant ergo origines ecclesiarum suarum, evolvant ordinem episcoporum suorum, ita per successionem ab initio decurrentem, ut primus ille episcopus aliquem ab apostolis vel apostolicis viris, qui tamen cum apostolis perseveraverit, habuerit auctorem et antecessorem.*

⁸ *Hist. eccles.*, 3, 2, 15, 21; PG, 20, cols. 216, 248, 256; ed. E. Schwartz, pp. 188, 228, 236.

⁹ *Hist. eccles.* 2, 23; PG, *ibid.*, col. 196; ed. E. Schwartz, p. 164.

¹⁰ *Hist. eccles.*, 3, 2, 21; 4, 1; PG, *ibid.*, cols. 216, 256, 303; ed. E. Schwartz, pp. 188, 236, 300.

¹¹ *Annales Abreviati* 2084 = Nero 14. On Jerome's translation see C. H. Turner, *Studies in Early Church History* (Oxford, 1912), pp. 139 seq.

¹² *Chronographus anni 354*, MGH, *Auct. ant.* 9, ed. Th. Mommsen p. 73; *Petrus ann. XXV, mens. uno d. IX . . . Passus autem cum Paulo die III Kal. Julias. Linus ann. XII m. IV d. XII.*

APOSTOLICITY BEFORE CHALCEDON

In spite of that, in the introduction to his translation of the *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies* and *Recognitions*, Rufinus still distinguishes the apostolic status of Peter in Rome from the episcopal status of Linus and Cletus, who are said to have administered the Roman Church during the life of the Apostle, and of Clemens who did so after his death.¹³ Such appears to be the attitude also of Epiphanius of Cyprus.¹⁴

Moreover, the anonymous author of a poem against Marcion, falsely ascribed to Tertullian, which seems to have been composed in southern Gaul at the end of the fifth or the beginning of the sixth century,¹⁵ continues to refer to Linus as the first bishop of Rome.¹⁶

These, however, are exceptions. The whole Latin West, from the end of the fourth century on, regarded Peter as the only founder of the Roman see and its first occupant. It must be said that St. Cyprian of Carthage had contributed considerably to this change, for he stressed more than any other writer of the Early Church the identical character of the apostolic and episcopal offices. In his letter to certain Spanish Churches, for example, Cyprian says that Matthias was ordained bishop in place of Judas.¹⁷ In another epistle Cyprian admonishes the deacons not to forget that "the Lord had chosen the apostles, that is to say bishops and prelates, and that the apostles had instituted the deacons after

¹³ PG, 1, col. 1207. This is particularly interesting because the author of the *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies* had already attributed the primacy to Peter. See B. Rehm, "Die Pseudo-Klementinen," I, Homilien, in *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller*, 42 (1953), pp. 239, 240 (Homily 17). Cf. also *Epistula Clementis ad Iacobum*, *ibid.*, pp. 5-7. Cf. H. Clavier, "La primauté de Pierre d'après les pseudo-Clémentines," *Rev. d'hist. et de phil. rel.*, 36 (1956), pp. 298-307.

¹⁴ *Panarion haereticorum*, chap. 27, 6, GCS, 25, ed. K. Holl, pp. 308 seq. Cf. C. Schmidt, *Studien zu den Pseudo-Clementinen (Texte und Untersuchungen*, 46 [1929]), pp. 336 seq., 350 seq. On Epiphanius' catalogue cf. E. Caspar, "Die ält. röm. Bischofsliste," *op. cit.*, pp. 168 seq., 194 seq.

¹⁵ K. Holl, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, 3 (Tübingen, 1928), pp. 13-53 ("Über Zeit und Heimat des pseudotertullianischen Gedichts adv. Marcionem"). On page 28 Holl reprinted the part of the poem containing the list of Roman bishops, from Oehler's edition of Tertullian's works.

¹⁶ S. F. *Tertulliani quae supersunt omnia*, 3 (ed. F. Oehler, 1853), p. 729, chap. 3, verses 275 seq.

¹⁷ *Epist.* 67, chap. 4, CSEL, 3, ed. G. Hartel, p. 738: *quando de ordinando in locum Judae episcopo Petrus ad plebem loquitur*.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

the Ascension of the Lord, in order to have servants in their episcopacy and in the Church."¹⁸

The succession of bishops to the apostles is, moreover, emphasized by Cyprian in another missive in which he declares that the saying of the Lord, "who hears you hears me and who hears me hears the One who had sent me" (Luke 10:16), was addressed "to the apostles and thus to all superiors who had succeeded to the apostles ordained as their vicars."¹⁹ Cyprian also spoke of the *cathedra Petri* and *ecclesia principalis*,²⁰ and he based the unity of the Church on the investiture given to Peter by Christ.²¹

Such outspoken declarations soon caused the differentiation between apostles and bishops to be forgotten. During the fourth century the practice of attributing the foundation of the see of Rome only to Peter, and of placing him at the head of Roman bishops became general. This is affirmed by Optatus Milevitanus,²² Jerome,²³ and also Augustine.²⁴ In the East, however, the old practice of not counting the apostles as first bishops of the Churches that they had founded continued.²⁵ Among the older ecclesiastical

¹⁸ *Epist.* 3, chap. 3, *ibid.*, p. 471: *meminisse autem diaconi debent quoniam apostolos id est episcopos et praepositos Dominus elegit, diaconos autem post ascensionem Domini in caelos apostoli sibi constituerunt episcopatus sui et ecclesiae ministros.*

¹⁹ *Epist.* 66, chap. 4, *ibid.*, p. 729: *qui (Deus et Christus) dicit ad apostolos ac per hoc ad omnes praepositos qui apostolis vicaria ordinatione succedunt.*

²⁰ *Epist.* 59 chap. 14, *ibid.*, p. 683. R. Höslinger, *Die alte afrikanische Kirche*, pp. 480 seq.

²¹ *De Unitate Ecclesiae*, chap. 4, *ibid.*, pp. 212, 213. *Epist.* 43, chap. 5, *ibid.*, p. 594.

²² *Libri VII*, bk. 2, chaps. 2, 3, *CSEL*, 26, ed. C. Ziwsa, p. 36: *In urbe Roma Petro primo cathedram episcopalem esse conlatam . . . sedit prior Petrus, cui successit Linus . . .*

²³ *De Viris Illustribus*, chaps. 15, 16, *PL*, 23, cols. 663–666: *Clemens . . . quartus post Petrum Romae episcopus, siquidem secundus Linus fuit, tertius Anacletus . . . Ignatius Antiochenae ecclesiae tertius post Petrum apostolum episcopus.*

²⁴ Namely in his letter written about 400. *Epist.* 53, chaps. 1–4, *PL*, 33, col. 196, *CSEL*, 34, pp. 153 seq.: *Si enim ordo episcoporum sibi succedentium considerandus est, quanto certius et vere salubriter ab ipso Petro numeramus . . . Petro enim succedit Linus, Lino Clemens . . .*

²⁵ For example in the letter of the Council of Antioch in 435 to Proclus of Constantinople (Mansi, 5, col. 1086B): *magnum martyrem Ignatium qui secundus post Petrum apostolorum primum Antiochenae sedis ordinavit ecclesiam.*

APOSTOLICITY BEFORE CHALCEDON

Greek writers only Socrates called Ignatius third bishop of Antioch from the Apostle Peter.²⁶

In the West from the middle of the fourth century on, the Roman see was often called simply the see of Peter; by Jerome, for example.²⁷ The Synod of Sardica (343) invited priests to appeal to "the head, that is, the see of the Apostle Peter."²⁸ Palladius of Ratiaria also called the Roman see the see of Peter, but, when protesting his condemnation by the Synod of Aquileia (381), he claimed that Peter's see was equal to any other episcopal see.²⁹

In the time of Pope Damasus (336-389) the idea of apostolicity made considerable progress in Rome and in the West. In addition to the identification of the Roman see with Peter's see, which by then had become common practice,³⁰ Damasus shows his preference for another title as a further means of emphasizing the apostolicity of his see: *sedes apostolica*,³¹ which seems to have been introduced previously by Liberius.³²

This new title was not only used by Damasus' successor Siri-

²⁶ *Hist. eccles.*, 6, 8, PG, 67, col. 692: "Ignace of Antioch, third after the Apostle Peter." Cf. the collection of passages concerning this problem in C. H. Turner, *Ecclesiae occidentalis Monumenta iuris antiquissima*, 1 (Oxford, 1899), pp. 246 seq. Cf. E. Molland, *op. cit.*, pp. 25 seq. Cf. also E. Metzner, *Die Verfassung der Kirche in den zwei ersten Jahrhunderten unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Schriften Harnacks* (Danzig, 1920), pp. 115-144 (die ersten Bischöfe Roms).

²⁷ *Epist.* 15, chap. 1, 16, chap. 2, CSEL, 54, ed. I. Hildberg, pp. 63, 69.

²⁸ Mansi, 3, col. 40B (letter of the synod to Pope Julius). Cf. also canon three, *ibid.*, col. 8.

²⁹ F. Kauffmann, *Aus der Schule des Wulfila. Auxentii Dorostorensis epistula de fide, vita et obitu Wulfilae, im Zusammenhang mit der Dissertatio Maximi contra Ambrosium* (Texte und Untersuchungen zur altgerman. Religionsgeschichte, [Strassburg, 1899], p. 86. Cf. L. Saltet, "Un texte nouveau—la Dissertatio Maximi contra Ambrosium," *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique publié par l'Institut catholique de Toulouse*, 3^e ser., 2 (1900), pp. 118-129.

³⁰ *Collectio Avellana*, CSEL, 35, ed. O. Günther, *Epist.* 1, p. 4. G. B. de Rossi, *Inscriptiones christianae Urbis Romae*, 2 (Rome, 1861, 1888), p. 147; N.S., 2, ed. A. Silvagni (Rome, 1922, 1935), p. 6 (no. 4096).

³¹ Letter to an Eastern Church, in Theodoretus, *Hist. eccles.*, 5, 10, GCS., 19, ed. Parmentier (Leipzig, 1911), p. 295. P. Coustant, *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum*, 1 (Paris, 1721), pp. 685-700 (*Epist.* 10, nos. 2, 17, 18). Letter of the Roman Synod of 378 to Gratian in Mansi, 3, col. 624 (*ad sublime sedis apostolicae sacrarium*). Gratian, in his answer (*ibid.*, col. 628), however, calls the Roman see only *sanctissima sedes*. Cf. also the inscription for the archives of St. Lawrence's Basilica, composed by Damasus (PL, 13, cols. 409 seq.).

³² In his letter to Eusebius of Vercelli (Mansi, 3, col. 204B).

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

cius,³³ but found ready acceptance too in the western provinces. It became familiar in Spain,³⁴ in Carthage,³⁵ in Aquileia³⁶ and it was also known to St. Augustine.³⁷ This new trend became so ingrained in the minds of some westerners that they began to derive the origin of episcopacy in general from Peter alone. It can be traced in the Acts of the synods of Mileve, and of Carthage during the fifth century, and it occurs in the correspondence of the Popes of the fifth century—Innocent I, Zosimus, Boniface, Xystus III. It is reflected also in Augustine's works, and in Pseudo-Augustine,³⁸ but it dies away in the sixth century

This stressing of the apostolicity of the Roman see in the West is easy to understand. There was in the Latin world only one see which could claim the honor of apostolic origin: the Roman see. Therefore Rome was the apostolic see—*sedes apostolica*—and came to be known as such. This made it easy for her to maintain and to strengthen her authority in the western provinces. The attitude of the bishops of Arles illustrates better than anything else this great advantage which Rome possessed over all other sees. Although able to point to the importance of this city in the political organization of Gaul, they thought that their best argument for the recovery of the primatial rights of Arles lay in linking their city with Peter. He, so they argued, was the founder of the bishopric when, according to the legendary tradition, he consecrated Trophimus as their first Bishop.

There was only one other city in the western provinces besides Arles that could boast of quasi-apostolic foundation; the city of Sirmium in the important prefecture of Illyricum. Like Arles, it was for some time an imperial residence.³⁹ An old legend attributed

³³ Mansi, 3, col. 670B.

³⁴ *Priscilliani Liber ad Damasum*, CSEL, 18, ed. G. Schepss, p. 34, Synod of Toledo in 400 (Mansi, 3, col. 1006E).

³⁵ *Codex canonum Ecclesiae Africanae*, Mansi, 3, cols. 763A, 771E.

³⁶ Rufinus to Pope Anastasius, *PL*, 21, col. 625B.

³⁷ *Sermo* 131, 10, *PL*, 38, col. 734. *Epist.* 186, 2, CSEL, 57, ed. A. Goldbacher, p. 47. In his *Contra litteras Petilianus* II, chaps. 51, 118, CSEL, 52, ed. M. Petschenig, (1909), p. 88, St. Augustine calls not only the Roman see, founded by Peter, apostolic, but also that of Jerusalem, founded by James.

³⁸ See the documentation in Batiffol's *Cathedra Petri*, pp. 95–103 (*Petrus initium episcopatus*).

³⁹ Amianus of Sirmium was well aware of the importance of his see. At the Synod of Aquileia, in 381, he made a very self-conscious declaration

APOSTOLICITY BEFORE CHALCEDON

the origin of its bishopric to St. Andronicus, one of the seventy disciples of Christ. It appears that Pope Zosimus had thought of establishing in the western part of Illyricum a kind of vicariate in order to bind the province more closely to Rome. There are reasons for believing that he had chosen the bishop of Salona in preference to the bishop of Sirmium for this honor, but the project had never been realized, and it is thus impossible to guess at the reasons that had prompted the Pope to give preference to Salona. Had it been the fear that the prestige of Sirmium, which boasted of quasi-apostolic origin, might grow to dangerous proportions? Another danger arose when, between 424 and 437, Sirmium probably became the seat of the *praefectus praetorio Illyrici*,⁴⁰ then completely incorporated in the eastern part of the Roman Empire. But the invasion of the Huns put an abrupt end to all of this. In 448 Sirmium was destroyed, and only the memory of its glorious past remained.⁴¹ There was left in the Latin world no other episcopal see which could rival Rome in its claim to apostolicity.

But in regard to apostolicity of sees, the situation in the eastern part of the Empire was different. There several important sees could claim the honor of having been founded by apostles. They were Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, and Ephesus. Beside these, less important sees in Asia Minor and Greece were at least visited by the apostles, according to the Acts and apocryphal writings. The apocryphal literature on the activities of the apostles began to appear as early as the second century,⁴² and became very popu-

(Mansi, 3, col. 604B): *Caput Illyrici, non nisi civitas est Sirmiensis. Ego igitur episcopus illius civitatis sum.*

⁴⁰ J. Zeiller, *Les origines chrétiennes dans les provinces danubiennes de l'Empire romain* (Paris, 1918), p. 6.

⁴¹ For more details on Sirmium and the papal policy regarding Illyricum see F. Dvornik, *Les légendes de Constantin et de Méthode vues de Byzance* (Prague, 1933), pp. 250 seq. It is very difficult to say when this legendary tradition concerning Sirmium began. Aquileia claimed apostolic origin and to have had as its first bishop St. Mark, who ordained Hermagoras as his successor. But this claim was not made until the end of the sixth century. Cf. P. Richard, "Aquilée," in *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique*, 3 (Paris, 1924), cols. 1113, 1114. On the claims of Salona, see J. Zeiller, *Les origines chrétiennes dans la province romaine de Dalmatie* (Paris, 1906), pp. 6 seq.

⁴² See *infra*, pp. 19.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

lar in the third and fourth centuries. When the apocryphal Acts of St. Andrew⁴³ are examined, it will be seen how many cities in Asia Minor and Greece, the apostles were supposed to have honored by their presence. In the latter province the cities of Thessalonica, Corinth, Philippi,^{43a} Athens, and Patras, which were visited by apostles, according to authentic or legendary tradition belonged, it is true, to the diocese of Illyricum. They were thus under the supra-metropolitan jurisdiction of Rome, but remained aware of their relationship, through their culture, language, and past history, with the East.⁴⁴

This circumstance naturally reduced in the East the prestige of the claim to apostolicity, and contributed to the easy victory gained for the principle of adaptation to the political division of the Empire. So it happened that Alexandria and Antioch rose to such prominence in the Eastern Church, not by virtue of their apostolic foundation, but because they were the most important cities of the Empire after Rome, and capitals of two vital dioceses. Thus Antioch was, for some time, St. Paul's center of activities, as well as the center of missions in Asia Minor.

This, however, does not mean that the apostolic origin of the principal sees was completely ignored. Eusebius calls the see of Jerusalem apostolic,⁴⁵ but only once, although he speaks of the bishops who occupied the see on several occasions. He does not give the title to any other see, which is indicative of an attitude of particular significance.

The bishops of Jerusalem must have stressed the apostolic character of their see more readily than others whose sees were

⁴³ See *infra*, pp. 172 seq.

^{43a} Tertullian, in his *De praescriptione haereticorum*, chap. 36 (CSEL, 70 ed. E. Kroymann, p. 45), calls these three Macedonian cities, together with Ephesus and Rome, apostolic.

⁴⁴ Cf. St. Basil's description, in his letter to Pope Damasus, of the countries which belong to the East: 'Ἡ Ἀνατολή πᾶσα . . . λέγω δὲ Ἀνατολήν τὰ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ μέχρι Αἰγύπτου. (PG, 32, col. 433C). The meaning may not appear clear, but as Basil speaks on the troubles created by the Arians, it is evident that he includes Illyricum and Egypt in the Orient, for both provinces were greatly perturbed by that heresy.

⁴⁵ *Hist. eccles.*, 7, 32, GCS, ed. Schwartz, p. 730. PG, 20, col. 736. The passage is the more illustrative as Eusebius speaks in this chapter of episcopal succession to all the important sees in the East. In 7, 18, ed. Schwartz, p. 672, PG, *ibid.*, col. 681, he calls the see of Jerusalem only "James's see."

APOSTOLICITY BEFORE CHALCEDON

founded by apostles or their disciples; very likely to strengthen their pretensions to a more exalted position in the hierarchy, for St. Jerome reproached John, Bishop of Jerusalem, for boasting that he was the holder of an apostolic see.⁴⁶

The same John of Jerusalem seems also to have called Theophilus, Bishop of Alexandria, apostolic. At least Jerome read John's letter, and quoted its opening words in his treatise against John. John is supposed to have greeted Theophilus of Alexandria as follows:⁴⁷ "But you, like a man of God adorned with apostolic grace, take care of all Churches, and principally of that which is in Jerusalem, being at the same time yourself distinguished by boundless solicitude for the Church of God which is subject to you." John's wording is, however, not clear. He seems rather to have had in mind an apostolic zeal that should be the characteristic of any bishop, and that especially distinguished the Bishop of Alexandria.

The four supra-metropolitan sees are called apostolic by Sozomen in his account of the Council of Nicaea. However, he gives first place to the bishop of Jerusalem.⁴⁸ This account illustrates a slight progress in the use of claims to apostolicity in the East; such claims, however, seemed to apply only to the main sees.

It might have been expected that the role which the see of Rome started to play during the Arian troubles would have increased the esteem in which it was held by orthodox Easterners, and would have encouraged them to appreciate the apostolic character of the bishops of Rome who were such strenuous defenders of the true faith as it was defined at Nicaea. Actually St. Athanasius most nearly personified the Western conception of the Roman see. In his *History of the Arians*⁴⁹ he exclaims: "[The Arians] have

⁴⁶ S. Hieronymus, *Epistola* 82, 10, *CSEL*, 55, ed. I. Hildberg, p. 117, *PL*, 22, col. 742: *apostolicam cathedram tenere se iactans*. Cf. *Epistola* 97, 4, *ibid.*, p. 184: *S. Marci cathedra*. John's predecessor Cyril is said to have claimed, even then, metropolitan rights, stressing that his see was apostolic. (Sozomenos, *Hist. eccles.*, 4, 25; *PG*, 67, col. 1196; Theodoret, *Hist. eccles.*, 2, 26, ed. L. Parmentier, p. 157.)

⁴⁷ S. Hieronymus, *Contra Joannem Hierosol.* *PL*, 23, chap. 37, cols. 406D, 407A: *tu quidem ut homo Dei, et apostolica ornatus gratia, curam omnium Ecclesiarum, maxime ejus quae Hierosolymis est, sustines, cum ipse plurimis sollicitudinibus Ecclesiae Dei, quae sub te est, distringaris*.

⁴⁸ *Hist. eccles.* 1, 17; *PG*, 67, col. 912.

⁴⁹ *Historia arianorum* chap. 35; *PG*, 25, col. 733, ed. H. G. Opitz, *Anastasius Werke*, 2, 1 (Berlin, 1940), p. 202: *Καὶ γὰρ οὐδὲ Λιβερίου τοῦ ἐπισκόπου Ῥώμης*

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

from the beginning not even spared Liberius, the Bishop of Rome, and have extended their fury to the citizens of that city. They have shown no respect for it as an apostolic see, they were not awed (by the fact) that it is the metropolis of Romania, nor did they remember that, when they wrote to them, they called them apostolic men?" This is interesting, and it is regrettable that the letters mentioned here by Athanasius are not preserved. In Athanasius' words may be detected, for the first time in the East, the blending of two ideas—accommodation to the civil administration, and apostolic origin. Although fully respectful of the apostolic character of the Roman see, the valiant champion of orthodoxy still sees in Rome, above all, the capital of the Empire.

Such was the situation in the Eastern part of the Empire, and things must be viewed in this light. That the Church had adapted the organization of its hierarchy to the territorial division of the Roman Empire, and to its administrative system, is generally recognized. But not all are ready to admit the logical consequences of this, or to consider the further evolution of the Church's organization, especially the rise of Constantinople, in the light of this fact. The effort of the bishops of the new imperial city to gain greater ascendancy in the Christian world, however, was one of the results of this development. It was evident in the conviction, which had become general, that the importance of the city in the Empire's political organization should determine the prominence of its bishop in the Church, and his precedence over other bishops of the province or diocese. Therefore, the exemption of the bishop of the new imperial capital from the jurisdiction of the metropolitan of Heracleia, and the decision of the Council of Constantinople (381)⁵⁰ to confer upon him a rank second only to that of the bishop of Rome, were logical applications of a principle commonly practiced by the Church.

κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐφείσαντο, ἀλλὰ καὶ μέχρι τῶν ἐκεῖ τὴν μανίαν ἐξέτειναν· καὶ οὐχ' ὅτι ἀποστολικὸς ἐστὶ θρόνος ἠδέσθησαν, οὐδ' ὅτι μητρόπολις ἡ Ῥώμη τῆς Ῥωμανίας ἐστίν, εὐλαβήθησαν, οὐδ' ὅτι πρότερον ἀποστολικούς αὐτοὺς ἀνδρας γράφοντες εἰρήκασιν ἐμνημόνευσαν.

⁵⁰ Mansi, 3, col. 560, canon three: Τὸν μέντοι Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπίσκοπον ἔχειν τὰ πρεσβεία τῆς τίμης μετὰ τὸν τῆς Ῥώμης ἐπίσκοπον, διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὴν νέαν Ῥώμην.

APOSTOLICITY BEFORE CHALCEDON

It is believed that the reaction in Rome to this innovation was very strong. Certainly it was strong in 451 when the Council of Chalcedon voted the so-called twenty-eighth canon. This confirmed canon three of the Council of Constantinople, and further extended the privileged position of the bishop of that city. The legates protested vehemently against this insult to the Church of Rome, and Leo I, in his letter to Anatolius of Constantinople, declared categorically that canon three of the Council of Constantinople had never been submitted to his predecessors for approval.⁵¹

Leo's direct and explicit declaration throws new light on what had happened in Rome after 381. How can his declaration be explained and reconciled with other facts, and with the general opinion about Rome's strong reaction against the Council of 381? First, the reason for the convocation of the Council must be considered. Emperor Theodosius, in convoking it, had in mind an assembly representing the eastern part of the Empire alone. As a matter of fact, at the beginning, the bishops of only the minor dioceses, and of the Orient were present. The invitation was extended later to the bishops of the diocese of Egypt, and to the Bishop of Thessalonica, the head of the bishops of Illyricum. Thus it was not originally an oecumenical Council, a fact that was recognized in the East. Its oecumenical character was not acknowledged definitely by both Churches until the time of the Council of Chalcedon,⁵² where its creed was solemnly accepted.⁵³

If the original intentions of the conciliar Fathers, which were to reorganize the ecclesiastical affairs of the Eastern dioceses and to legislate for them alone, are borne in mind, Leo's statement becomes understandable. The canons voted by the Fathers were to apply only to the East, and the promotion of the bishop of Constantinople to such an exalted rank was a measure which affected primarily the status of the bishops of only the eastern diocesan capitals. Therefore, as this measure concerned the East alone, and did not affect Rome's precedence, it is quite possible, nay, even

⁵¹ See *infra* pp. 88-92.

⁵² Cf. C. J. Hefele, H. Leclercq., *Histoire des Conciles*, 2, pp. 42-45.

⁵³ Cf. E. Schwartz, "Das Nicaenum und das Constantinopolitanum der Synode von Chalkedon," *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 24 (1925), pp. 38-88.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

logical, that the canons voted by the Council were not submitted officially to the Bishop of Rome for confirmation.

An incident which had taken place before the convocation of the Council illustrates even more clearly that the promotion of Constantinople was primarily a measure changing the ecclesiastical constellation of the East. Hitherto, the Eastern Church had been dominated by the powerful bishops of Alexandria. One of them, Bishop Peter, a strict Nicene, had extended his influence to Antioch by supporting the rigoristic Bishop Paulinus against Bishop Meletius.⁵⁴ The latter, although originally sympathetic to the Arians, had adopted the Catholic Creed, and was accepted by the majority of the Antiochenes. Bishop Peter had also tried to install at Constantinople a bishop of his own selection, who would be subservient to Alexandria. His choice fell on the disreputable adventurer, Maximus the Cynic. Maximus won the confidence of the guileless Gregory of Nazianzus, the orthodox Bishop of Constantinople. But, betraying his generous and naive host, Maximus let himself be secretly ordained Bishop of Constantinople by some Egyptian bishops, who had been sent by Peter of Alexandria, with an escort of a gang of Alexandrian sailors.⁵⁵ The fraudulent Bishop was rejected by the catholics of Constantinople and by the Emperor, and was denounced by Pope Damasus, who learned of the incident from the Bishop of Thessalonica. After this even Peter of Alexandria had to dissociate himself from Maximus.

The case of Maximus was considered by the Fathers of the Council in 381, and it was decreed by canon four that his ordination was not valid.⁵⁶ The perpetrator of the scandalous affair was, however, well-known. When considered in its relationship to these events, the true purpose of canon three of the Council of Constantinople becomes apparent. It was a measure designed to break the hold of Alexandria over the Eastern dioceses in religious matters, and to give to Constantinople authority over the Eastern Church.

⁵⁴ On this local schism and its consequences see F. Cavallera, *Le schisme d'Antioche* (Paris, 1905).

⁵⁵ See Gregorius Nazianzus, *Carmen XI de vita sua*, vss. 807-1029. PG, 37, cols. 1085-1100. Hieronymus, *De viris illustribus*, chap. 127, PL, 23, col. 754.

⁵⁶ Mansi, 3, col. 560. Cf. Sozomenos, *Hist. eccles.*, 7, chap. 9, PG, 67, cols. 1436 seq.

APOSTOLICITY BEFORE CHALCEDON

Because the principle of adaptation to the political division of the Empire was the leading and decisive factor in Church organization, especially in the East, and was again stressed at the Council of 381, the canon encountered no opposition among the Eastern prelates. Peter's brother and successor, Timothy of Alexandria, had to swallow the bitter pill, and signed with Peter, Bishop of Oxyrhynchus, the decisions of the Council; its Creed and its canons.⁵⁷ The bishop of Alexandria thus ceded the right of precedence, which he had hitherto possessed in the East, to the bishop of the imperial capital.

When all this is borne in mind, it becomes clear that this first promotion of the bishopric of Constantinople was in no way inspired by an anti-Roman bias. However, it affected the interests of the West, and, indirectly, of Rome, for the bishops of Alexandria had always maintained the closest relationship with Rome and the West, where their attitude toward the uncompromising Nicene, Paulinus of Antioch, was fully shared. The decline of Alexandria could easily, therefore, have meant the decline also of Roman and Western influences on religious affairs in the East.

The intimate link between Alexandria and the West is particularly well documented in the letter sent by the synod of Aquileia (381) to the Emperors. Probably under the persuasion of an envoy of Paulinus of Antioch, Ambrose of Milan, the principal actor in this affair and the inspirer of the letter, asked the Emperors to convoke a synod in Alexandria to heal the local schism in Antioch.⁵⁸

The course of events subsequent to the dispatch of this letter illustrates, even better, the tension between East and West that had begun to develop, and the determination of the Easterners to solve their own difficulties without the intervention of the Westerners.⁵⁹

Maximus, the fraudulent "Bishop" of Constantinople, condemned by the synod of that city, appeared in Aquileia, and succeeded in duping Ambrose and the bishops of the Aquileian synod into believing that he was the rightful Bishop of the capital,

⁵⁷ See E. Schwartz, "Zur Kirchengeschichte des vierten Jahrhunderts," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 34 (1935), p. 204.

⁵⁸ S. Ambrosius, *Epistolarum classis* 1, *Epist.* 12; *PL*, 16, cols. 987 seq.

⁵⁹ See E. Schwartz, "Zur Kirchengeschichte," *op. cit.*, pp. 206 seq.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

and that he was unjustly condemned and persecuted. The news which Maximus brought concerning the Council of Constantinople caused alarm in Aquileia. According to his report, not only had he himself been condemned, but a layman Nectarius had been appointed Bishop of Constantinople after the resignation of Gregory of Nazianzus. There were false rumors that Nectarius had been excommunicated by his own consecrators soon after the act. Meletius of Antioch died in Constantinople while the synod was in session, and instead of giving his see to Paulinus, Theodosius allowed Flavian to be elected and consecrated as Meletius' successor.

Ambrose and the bishops of Northern Italy were greatly shocked by the news of Flavian's appointment, and, without prior consultation with Rome or with the Eastern bishops, they accepted Maximus into communion. They addressed a letter of indignation to Theodosius,⁶⁰ complaining that the bishops of the East, when making their appointments to the sees of Constantinople and Antioch, had not treated the Westerners with due respect, and asking for the convocation of an oecumenical synod in Rome, which was recognized as the premier see in Christendom even in the East.

The Emperor's answer has been lost, but Ambrose's second letter allows us to suppose that Theodosius did not appreciate Western interference in Eastern affairs—another indication that the decisions of the Council of Constantinople of 381 were regarded as primarily concerned with the affairs of the East. Of course the Emperor rejected the proposal for convoking a general council at Rome.⁶¹

Undismayed by the fact that they had committed a serious blunder in the case of Maximus, Ambrose and his bishops insisted once more on the necessity of a new synod in Rome, not only to deal with the Antiochene schism, but also to condemn the doctrine of Apollinarius. Thus they ignored the fact that he had already

⁶⁰ S. Ambrosius, *Epist.* 13, *ibid.*, cols. 990 seq. On the role played by Ambrose during these incidents, see especially H. von Campenhausen, *Ambrosius von Mailand als Kirchenpolitiker* (Berlin, Leipzig, 1929, *Arbeiten zur Kirchengesch.* 12), pp. 129–153, and F. H. Dudden, *The Life and Times of St. Ambrose* (Oxford, 1935), pp. 206–216.

⁶¹ S. Ambrosius, *Epist.* 14, *ibid.*, cols. 993 seq.

APOSTOLICITY BEFORE CHALCEDON

been condemned by the Council of Constantinople of 381 and by Pope Damasus. Letters had been dispatched also by the Emperor Gratian and by the Western bishops, including Pope Damasus, inviting the Easterners to attend the Council of Rome. These letters had been transmitted by Theodosius to the Eastern bishops, whom he had summoned to a new synod to be held again in Constantinople, not in Rome. The synod convened in the summer of 382.

The Eastern bishops wrote a letter to the Western bishops⁶² in which they excused themselves from going to Rome because of the amount of time needed to make the trip, and the length and difficulties of the journey. Besides, they said, they felt it their duty to stay at home to look after the interests of their own Churches. They courteously thanked their Western colleagues for their solicitude, which they found particularly gratifying since the West had been rather reluctant to express its sympathy when the Eastern Church was persecuted by the Arians for its orthodox faith. They were, however, the letter continued, sending some delegates to Rome who would "not only assure you that our intentions are peaceful and directed toward union, but also set forth our feelings concerning the true faith."

After describing the main doctrines against which the heretics had fought, and for which the orthodox faith had so greatly suffered, the Easterners reported on their achievements in the administration of their Church. Acting according to the canons, they said, they had elected and ordained Nectarius as Bishop of the "newly rebuilt" Church of Constantinople. They went on: "In the oldest and truly apostolic Church of Antioch in Syria, where for the first time the venerable name of Christians had been heard,

⁶² It was preserved by Theodoret in his *Hist. eccles.* 5, ed. L. Parmentier, pp. 289 seq. Mansi, 3, cols. 581-588. A similar point of view concerning Rome's position in the Church can be traced in the letter that the Easterners sent, in 340, from Antioch to Pope Julius, a resumé of which is preserved in the Church History of Sozomen (*PL*, 61, bk. 3, chap. 8, col. 1053). Although in this letter the Easterners refused the Pope's invitation to come to Rome, they showed their great respect for the see "venerated by all, which has been from the beginning the dwelling of the apostles and the metropolis of piety" (ἀποστόλων φροντιστήριον καὶ εὐσεβείας μητρόπολιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς γεγενημένην). They refused, however, to regard themselves subordinate because, as they pointed out, "the Churches are not ranked according to their size and populousness."

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

the bishops of the eparchia and of the whole diocese of the Orient gathered and ordained, according to the canons, the most reverend and most beloved of God, Bishop Flavian.... In the Church of Jerusalem which is the mother of all Churches we recognize as Bishop, the most reverend and most beloved of God—Cyril....”

The whole tenor of the letter reveals that the Easterners were determined to settle their own administrative affairs alone, without the intervention of the Westerners, which confirms the impression that all disciplinary and administrative measures taken by the Council of Constantinople in 381 pertained to the Eastern Church only. Canon three, also, should be so interpreted.

Although this canon was not sent to the West for approval, it was certainly known in both Rome and Milan in the autumn of 381. St. Ambrose, in his letters, treats the Council of 381 as nonexistent, but his intervention in the affair was decidedly undiplomatic, and ended in failure. He saw clearly that the Easterners were embarking on a dangerous “isolationist” policy,⁶³ and tried to persuade them to regard their affairs from an oecumenical point of view. Unfortunately, however, because of his impetuosity and blunders, he only encouraged them in their attitude.

Neither Ambrose nor the Synod of Rome of 382 paid any attention to canon three, and the West persisted in its support of Paulinus of Antioch. However, they quietly accepted defeat in their support of Alexandria, for what could they have done when the Bishop of Alexandria himself signed the canon and surrendered his prerogative to the Bishop of Constantinople? The principle of adaption to the administrative division of the Empire was still so deeply ingrained in the minds of the Westerners in the fourth century that an open protest against the elevation of Constantinople in Church affairs, was unthinkable. It can thus be concluded that the West tacitly, though reluctantly, accepted the third canon, which was voted in Constantinople in 381.⁶⁴

⁶³ Cf. P. Batiffol, *Le siège apostolique*, pp. 141 seq.

⁶⁴ On part three of the so-called *Decretum Gelasianum* see P. Batiffol, *ibid.*, pp. 146–150. It was thought that this was voted by the Roman Synod of 382 in protest against canon three of Constantinople, because it attributed the second and third places in the Church to Alexandria and Antioch respectively, by virtue of these sees being connected with the activity of St. Peter. The document was, however, composed at the end of the fifth century.

APOSTOLICITY BEFORE CHALCEDON

The letter of 382 from the Easterners to the Westerners is important in yet another respect. It is a further indication of the development of the idea of apostolicity in the East. The references by the Fathers to "the truly apostolic Church of Antioch" and to Jerusalem as "the mother of all Churches" are noteworthy.

It is regrettable that the tone of the invitation sent to the Easterners is not known. However, it would be reasonable to suppose that, although St. Ambrose played the main role in these events, and although Pope Damasus was completely under his influence, the invitation was conceived in the episcopal chancery of Rome. Judging from the fashion and style used by the Pope in his correspondence, it can almost certainly be presumed that he stressed in his letter the apostolicity of his see. If this is so, it must be concluded from the courtesy of the answer of the Council of 382 that the Easterners were not impressed by Damasus' insistence on the apostolic character of the Roman see. Their letter was addressed not only to the Pope, but also to all other bishops who may have signed his invitation:

"To the most honorable and most reverend brothers and colleagues in the ministry, Damasus, Ambrose, Britton, Valerian, Acholius, Anemius, Basil, and to other holy bishops gathered in the great city of Rome, the holy synod of orthodox bishops who are gathered in the great city of Constantinople, send greetings in Christ."

The passage of the letter on the "oldest and truly apostolic Church of Antioch" is rather interesting. It could be taken as a gentle reminder to the Pope that there were other apostolic sees, of which Antioch was the most prominent because it was there that the believers in Christ were first called Christians. A similar interpretation could be placed on the Easterners' description of Jerusalem as "the mother of all Churches," but the polite and friendly tone of the letter, in spite of some rather sarcastic remarks, and the assurance that the Easterners were determined to maintain the best of relations with the Westerners, seem to disprove such an interpretation. As can be seen, while not denying to the see of Rome its apostolic character, the Easterners did not consider it the only basis for Rome's prominent position in the Church.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

This appears to have been the general feeling in the East, as is illustrated by the attitude of St. Basil. In his correspondence with the Westerners he never calls the Roman see apostolic, nor does he give this title to any other see in the East. He addresses his letters to the bishops of the principal sees by referring to the city in which their seat was situated. Also, in his report to Damasus, in which he implores spiritual and material help for the Eastern Church, St. Basil calls the Pope simply "most reverend Father."⁶⁵ In another letter⁶⁶ he addresses him only as "most celebrated Bishop." There was, of course, an occasion when Basil named Damasus the "coryphaeus of the West,"⁶⁷ but at another time, when speaking of the necessity of communicating with the Pope, he calls him simply "Bishop of Rome."⁶⁸ Most of the letters in his correspondence with the West, are addressed, not to the Pope, but to the bishops of Italy and Gaul,⁶⁹ or "to the Westerners."⁷⁰ Furthermore, when, in his letters to Eastern correspondents, he refers to contacts with the Western Church, he does not call it the Roman Church, but speaks of the West, and of the Westerners.⁷¹ On two separate occasions he writes rather bitterly about the West's ignorance of the state of things in the East.⁷²

Naturally, Basil acknowledges Peter as the first of the apostles to whom the keys of heaven have been entrusted,⁷³ but in his letter to Ambrose⁷⁴ he also attributes an apostolic character to every bishop, as when he calls the see of Milan "the see of the apostles." He thus seems to regard every bishop as a successor to the apostles, a doctrine which is also reflected in the first Letter of Clement to the Corinthians,⁷⁵ and in the *Philosophoumena* of St. Hippolytus

⁶⁵ *Epist.* 70, *PG*, 32, col. 433C.

⁶⁶ *Epist.* 266, *ibid.*, col. 993B.

⁶⁷ *Epist.* 238, chap. 2, *ibid.*, col. 893B.

⁶⁸ *Epist.* 69, chap. 1, *ibid.*, col. 432A.

⁶⁹ *Epist.* 92 and 243, *ibid.*, cols. 477, 901.

⁷⁰ *Epist.* 90 and 263, *ibid.*, cols. 472, 976.

⁷¹ *Epist.* 66, 89, 120, 129 (chap. 3), 138, 156 (chap. 3), 214 (chap. 2), 238 (chap. 2), 253, *ibid.*, cols. 424, 469, 537, 560, 617, 785, 893, 940.

⁷² *Epist.* 214, 239, *ibid.*, cols. 785, 893.

⁷³ *Sermo.* VII. *De peccato*, chap. 5., *ibid.*, col. 1204C.

⁷⁴ *Epist.* 197, *ibid.*, col. 709: αὐτός σε ὁ Κύριος ἀπὸ τῶν κριτῶν τῆς γῆς ἐπὶ τὴν καθέδραν τῶν ἀποστόλων μετέθηκεν.

⁷⁵ Chaps. 42, 1-4; 44, 2-3, *The Apostolic Fathers*, ed. J. B. Lightfoot, 2 (London, 1890), pp. 127 seq., 131 seq. English translation by F. Glimm, *The*

APOSTOLICITY BEFORE CHALCEDON

of Rome.⁷⁶ Similar opinions were held, too, by Tertullian.⁷⁷ This is a very wide extension of the idea of apostolicity, which, meanwhile, in the West, because of a different evolutionary process, became connected only with the see of Rome, founded by Peter.

It would be vain to search in St. John Chrysostom's numerous works for any passage stressing the apostolic character of the Roman see, or of its bishops. The famous homilist, when speaking of St. Peter, often exalts the prominent position of the coryphaeus⁷⁸ among the apostles, and states that Peter occupied the see of "the most imperial city" of Rome.⁷⁹ The most impressive passage in the works of Chrysostom is that in which he mentions Peter in connection with Rome and Antioch. In his homily on the titles of the Acts of the apostles, St. John comments on Acts 3:2 and Matt. 16:18, and recalls Peter's activity in Antioch and in Rome.⁸⁰

"When recalling Peter, I remembered also the other Peter, our common father and doctor [he means Flavian, Bishop of Antioch], who in achieving the fullness of his virtue, obtained also possession of his see. This is the great prerogative of our city, that it received the coryphaeus of the apostles from the beginning as [its] teacher. It is proper that [the city] which, before the rest of the world, was adorned with the Christian name, should obtain the first of the apostles for its pastor. However, when we obtained him as teacher, we did not keep him to the end, but ceded him to the imperial

Apostolic Fathers (New York, 1947), pp. 42 seq: "[The apostles] . . . preaching . . . throughout the country and the cities, they appointed their first-fruits, after testing them by the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons of those who should believe They appointed the above-mentioned men, and afterwards gave them a permanent character, so that, as they died, other approved men should succeed to their ministry."

⁷⁶ *Philosophoumena*, *Proemium* 6, *GCS*, 26, ed. P. Wendland, p. 3.

⁷⁷ Cf. *Liber de Praescriptionibus*, *PL*, 2, chap. 20, col. 32, *Adversus Marcionem*, IV, chap. 5, *ibid.*, col. 366, *CSEL*, 47, ed. E. Kroymann, p. 430. Cf. also the letter of Paulinus of Nola written about 394 to Alypius of Tagaste. *Epist.* 3, 1, *CSEL*, 29, ed. G. Hartel, p. 14.

⁷⁸ Here are some of the passages: *De Precatione* II, *PG*, 50, col. 784; *Hom. in Matt.* 18, 23, vol. 51, col. 20; *Hom. in Gal.* 2, 11, *ibid.*, col. 379; *In Ps.* 129 vol. 55, col. 375; *Hom. in II Tim* 3, 1, vol. 56, col. 275; *Hom. in Matt.* vol. 58, col. 533; *Hom. 73 in Joannem*, vol. 59, col. 396; *Hom. 22 in Acts Ap.*, vol. 60, col. 171, *Hom. 29 in Ep. ad Rom.*, *ibid.*, col. 660; *Hom. 21, 38 in Ep. I ad Cor.* vol. 61, cols. 172, 327.

⁷⁹ *In Ps.* 48, *PG*, 55, cols. 231 seq.

⁸⁰ *In Inscriptiones actorum* II, *PG*, 51, col. 86.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

city of Rome. But [I should] rather [say that] we kept him forever. Even if we are not in possession of Peter's body, we are in possession of his faith. Possessing Peter's faith, we possess Peter."

This is all that is to be found in Chrysostom's writings about the apostolic character of a see, but it is especially significant because, after he was unjustly condemned, he appealed to the Westerners and to Pope Innocent.⁸¹

More revealing than the writings of the Fathers are the Acts of the Councils and official correspondence between the Eastern hierarchy and the Roman see. The most outstanding occasion for bringing into focus the differing points of view between East and West concerning the idea of apostolicity was the Council of Ephesus (431), and this Council is additionally important to our investigation because it marked the culminating point also in the struggle for the leadership of Eastern Christianity that raged for several decades between the bishops of Alexandria and the bishops of the imperial capital of Constantinople, which had only recently been promoted to second place in the Church.

It was natural that Alexandria, the City of Alexander the Great, which had been for centuries the metropolis of a mighty kingdom, as well as a meeting place and melting pot of great civilizations, which was the recognized capital of the Egyptian people—proud of its glorious past — and which always mistrusted anything that came from Old or New Rome, should be anxious to conserve its leading position in the Christian East, to which it had given its first great theologians and thinkers. The theological struggles of the fourth and fifth centuries are more easily understood when studied in the light of the antagonism between the two mighty Eastern cities, Alexandria and Constantinople.⁸² In this struggle

⁸¹ Cf. P. Batifol, *op. cit.*, pp. 312 seq. M. Jugie who studied Chrysostom's attitude toward the Roman primacy, came to the following conclusions ("S. Jean Chrysostome et la primauté de S. Pierre, *Echos d'Orient*" [1908], pp. 5-15, 193-202): (on page 193) "Nous n'avons pu trouver aucun texte affirmant explicitement et sans conteste possible que l'évêque de Rome est le successeur de Saint Pierre dans sa primauté."

⁸² Cf. N. H. Baynes' short but masterly sketch of this struggle, "Alexandria and Constantinople: A Study in Ecclesiastical Diplomacy," *The Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, 12 (1926), pp. 145-156. For more details see J. Faivre, "Alexandrie," *Dictionnaire d'hist. et de géogr. ecclés.*, 1 (1914), cols. 305 seq.

APOSTOLICITY BEFORE CHALCEDON

Alexandria long played the leading role, for Constantinople had to bow to the pro-Arian policy of Constantius, while the energetic and passionate Athanasius, Patriarch of Alexandria, became the most eloquent defender of orthodoxy, and was hailed and venerated throughout the orthodox world.

The ardent opposition of the bishops of Alexandria to the doctrine favored by the emperors and bishops of the Imperial City apparently gained impetus from Egyptian national particularism. The main reason for Constantius' siding with Arianism lay in his fear that the orthodox doctrine, accepting Father and Son as two distinct persons of the same divine nature, might compromise the idea of the singleness of the divine monarchy and, at the same time, the strength and unity of the earthly monarchy; this earthly monarchy, the *basileia*, being an imitation of its heavenly pattern. If this was Constantius' reasoning, the adherents of Egyptian particularism, always inclined to look askance at ideas originating in the imperial palace, must have felt a certain satisfaction in defending a doctrine that favored Constantius' idea of the earthly *basileia*. These sentiments added to the bitterness of the words in which Athanasius propounded his theories on the limitation of imperial power and the independence of the Church in matters of faith.⁸³

The enhanced prestige won by Athanasius assured Alexandria a leading position in the eyes of the Eastern orthodox peoples, and won Western support for the ambitious plans of Athanasius' successor, Peter II (375-381). As has been seen, however, Peter's

⁸³ One of the most outspoken declarations in this matter made by Athanasius is to be found in *Historia arianorum*, chaps. 51, 52; *PG*, 25, cols. 753 seq. "Why is he [Constantius] so keen on gathering Arians into the Church and on protecting them, whilst he sends others into exile? Why does he pretend to be so observant of the canons, when he transgresses every one of them? Which canon tells him to expel a bishop from his palace? Which canon orders soldiers to invade our churches? Who commissioned counts and obscure eunuchs to manage Church affairs or to promulgate by edict the decisions of those we call bishops? . . . If it is the bishops' business to issue decrees, how does it concern the emperor? And if it is the emperor's business to issue threats, what need is there of men called bishops? Who ever heard of such a thing? When did a Church decree receive its authority or its value from the emperor? Numberless synods have met before and numberless decrees have been issued, but never did the Fathers entrust such things to the emperor, never did an emperor interfere with the things of the Church."

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

plan ended in failure, and his successor, Timothy, had to sign the third canon voted by the Council of Constantinople, granting to Alexandria's rival precedence over both Alexandria and Antioch. In spite of this defeat, however, Timothy did not despair, and he later enjoyed the satisfaction of seeing Gregory of Nazianzus, to whom the Emperor Theodosius had restored the church of Hagia Sophia (26 November 380), which had been held until then by the Arians, forced to abdicate the bishopric of Constantinople. In the intrigues that led to this state of affairs Timothy played his part.

Timothy's successor, Theophilus, (394-412) won another major success in the struggle for leadership in the East when he intervened directly in the affairs of Constantinople. At that time the Imperial City underwent, thanks to the machinations of Theophilus, the supreme humiliation of having its Bishop, St. John Chrysostom, condemned by the Synod of the Oak (403), unjustly deposed, and sent into exile.

An even greater triumph over the rival see was registered by St. Cyril of Alexandria (412-444), when Nestorius, Bishop of Constantinople, was convicted of heresy by the Oecumenical Council of Ephesus (431), deprived of his dignity, and sent into exile. This was the greatest success ever recorded by Alexandria. The alliance between Alexandria and Rome was again established at this time, and Rome's support helped Cyril in his struggle for power.

Cyril acted unscrupulously in the name of Pope Celestine during the first session of the Council of Ephesus, before the arrival of the Roman legates. It matters little that his great victory was obtained by schemes which, for their boldness and lack of scruple, still cause historians to shake their heads in bewildered astonishment, for this victory illustrates conclusively the degree of ascendancy that Alexandria had won in the fifth century.⁸⁴

In their struggle, the bishops of Alexandria could boast of one great advantage over the upstart Church of Constantinople. Their see was an apostolic foundation, and St. Mark, its first bishop, was a disciple of St. Peter, whose preaching he was believed to

⁸⁴ On Cyril's diplomatic methods see P. Batiffol's study "Les présents de S. Cyrille à la cour de Constantinople," *Etudes de liturgie et d'archéologie chrétienne* (Paris, 1919), pp. 154-179.

APOSTOLICITY BEFORE CHALCEDON

have preserved for posterity. It might have been expected that this fact would be exploited to the full against Constantinople.

In spite of the support he was given by Rome, St. Athanasius did not, surprisingly enough, use the apostolic argument in his reckless fight for orthodoxy and the freedom of the Church in matters of faith. St. Cyril of Alexandria, however, might have been counted upon to rely more on this argument, which would have strengthened his position, in the opinion of his Western contemporaries as in modern opinion, but an examination of the Acts of the Council of Ephesus, the scene of his greatest triumph, shows that there was little progress in the East toward any appreciation in Church leadership of the value of the idea of apostolicity.

This want of appreciation of the significance of apostolicity becomes clear in a review of the official correspondence between Alexandria, Constantinople, Rome, and Antioch which preceded the Council. In the correspondence between the four supra-metropolitans of the Eastern Church there is not one allusion to the apostolic character of the sees of Alexandria, Antioch, or Jerusalem. In their letters these bishops addressed each other very simply by such titles as most reverend, most holy, most beloved, etc., colleague in the ministry.⁸⁵ Nor does Cyril of Alexandria ever try to give his words more weight by stressing the apostolic origin of his see. When announcing to Nestorius and to the people of Constantinople the condemnation by a synod held in Alexandria, of that prelate's doctrine, Cyril points out that it was the synod of the diocese of Egypt.⁸⁶

Nestorius' letters to Pope Celestine are written in the same vein.⁸⁷ In replying, the Pope aligns the Church of Rome with the Churches of Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople, without adding the word "apostolic."⁸⁸

⁸⁵ For example, Nestorius to Cyril (Mansi, 4, cols. 885, 892; ed. E. Schwartz, t. 1, vol. 1, pt. 1, pp. 25, 29): τῷ θεοφιλεστάτῳ καὶ ἀγιωτάτῳ μου συλλειτουργῷ Κυρίλλῳ . . . τῷ εὐλαβεστάτῳ καὶ θεοφιλεστάτῳ συλλειτουργῷ . . .

⁸⁶ Mansi, *ibid.*, cols. 1068–1093: Κύριλλος καὶ ἡ συνελθοῦσα σύνοδος ἐν Ἀλεξανδρίᾳ ἐκ τῆς Αἰγυπτιακῆς διοικήσεως . . . ; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, pp. 33–42.

⁸⁷ Mansi, *ibid.*, cols. 1021 seq.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, cols. 1025 seq., col. 1036; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, pp. 77 seq., 83: ἅπερ καὶ ἡ Ῥωμαίων καὶ ἡ Ἀλεξανδρέων . . . καὶ ἡ ἀγία ἡ κατὰ τὴν μεγάλην Κωνσταντινούπολιν ἐκκλησία . . . Cf. also the Pope's letter to John of Antioch, Mansi, *ibid.*, col. 1049; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, p. 91.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

It is interesting to follow Cyril of Alexandria's method of addressing the Pope and of speaking about him and his Church. He calls him "the most holy and most beloved of God, Father Celestine,"⁸⁹ "the holy, most pious Bishop of the Church of the Romans,"⁹⁰ "the most holy and most pious brother of mine and colleague in the ministry, Celestine, the Bishop of the great city of Rome,"⁹¹ or simply "the Bishop of the Church of the Romans."⁹²

In his letter to John of Antioch, Cyril complains that Nestorius had dared to quote his doctrine in a letter sent "to my Master, the most pious Celestine, Bishop of the Church of the Romans."⁹³ In his letter to Nestorius John speaks also of "my Master, the most pious Bishop Celestine."⁹⁴ No expression of a special submission by the two Bishops to the Pope's authority can however be inferred from these words. Cyril salutes alike as "my Master" the Bishops of Antioch⁹⁵ and of Jerusalem,⁹⁶ and the Bishop of Antioch uses the same form of address to Nestorius.⁹⁷ It is, thus, simply a form of courtesy.

Such, evidently, was the established etiquette in the Eastern Church, and the Fathers of the Council of Ephesus followed this protocol strictly during the first session of the synod. Cyril, who on that occasion also represented the Pope, is called throughout "the most holy and most reverend Father, Bishop of Alexandria" with no additional title to show the prominent status of his see. Pope Celestine is often mentioned, and, as revealed in the official correspondence examined above, is given similar titles, such as "the most holy, most pious Archbishop of the Church of the Romans, holy Father, colleague in the ministry, holy Archbishop of the

⁸⁹ Letter to the Pope, Mansi, *ibid.*, col. 1012B.

⁹⁰ Letter to the people of Constantinople, *ibid.*, col. 1093; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, p. 113.

⁹¹ Letter to the monks of Constantinople, Mansi, *ibid.*, col. 1097C.

⁹² Letter to Juvenal of Jerusalem, *ibid.*, col. 1060C.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, col. 1052A: τῷ κυρίῳ μου καὶ θεοσεβεστάτῳ ἐπισκόπῳ τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας. ed. E. Schwartz., *ibid.*, p. 92.

⁹⁴ Mansi, *ibid.*, col. 1064A: Ὁ κύριος μου ὁ θεοφιλέστατος Κελεστίνος ὁ ἐπίσκοπος; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, p. 94.

⁹⁵ Mansi, *ibid.*, col. 1049E.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, col. 1057E.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, col. 1061A; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, p. 93.

APOSTOLICITY BEFORE CHALCEDON

great city of Rome."⁹⁸ Popes Julius and Felix, whose writings were read, are called simply "most holy Bishops," as are also the Bishops of Alexandria and Milan.⁹⁹

A definite innovation in this respect is noticed in the minutes of the second session of the Council. The papal legates, Bishops Arcadius and Projectus, and the priest Philip, joined the assembly and brought about a revolutionary change in protocol. They carried a letter addressed to the Council by "the most holy and most blessed Pope Celestine, Bishop of the apostolic see," and all three demanded permission to read it. They stressed the word "apostolic" on this occasion.¹⁰⁰

This innovation in the title of the Bishop of Rome was unprecedented in the East, but Cyril of Alexandria courteously accepted it, and gave orders that the letter "of the most holy and most saintly Bishop of the holy apostolic see of the Romans, Celestine," be read.¹⁰¹ Juvenal of Jerusalem, and Flavianus of Philippi were not so discreet, for, when asking for the reading of the Greek translation of the letter, they called Celestine only "the most holy, and most saintly Bishop of the great city of Rome." In their acclamations, after the reading of the letter, the Fathers, too, failed to adopt the new title introduced by the legates, although they held Celestine in high esteem, eulogizing him as "a new Paul and guardian of the faith."¹⁰² Firmus, Bishop of Caesarea of Cappadocia, however, rallied promptly to the new mode of address, and in his short speech of thanksgiving spoke of "the apostolic and holy throne of the most holy Bishop Celestine."

Apparently the legates demanded that they be addressed as representatives of the apostolic see. In the minutes of the second session there is still some diversity as to their titles. The legates and their notary, Siricius, are described as representing the Roman

⁹⁸ Mansi, *ibid.*, cols. 1129A, 1177E, 1180B, 1212C, 1240C, 1256E; ed. Schwartz, t. 1, vol. 1, pt. 2, pp. 8, 36, 54, 104.

⁹⁹ Mansi, *ibid.*, cols. 1188 seq.; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, p. 41.

¹⁰⁰ Mansi, *ibid.*, col. 1281B: 'Ο ἀγιώτατος καὶ μακαριώτατος πάπας ἡμῶν Κελεστίνος, ὁ τῆς ἀποστολικῆς καθέδρας ἐπίσκοπος . . . Col. 1281C, D: γράμματα τοῦ ἁγίου, καὶ μετὰ πάσης προσκυνήσεως ὀνομαζομένου πάπα Κελεστίνου, τῆς ἀποστολικῆς καθέδρας ἐπισκόπου; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, t. 1, vol. 1, pt. 3, pp. 53, 54.

¹⁰¹ Mansi, *ibid.*, col. 1281C; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, p. 54.

¹⁰² Mansi, *ibid.*, col. 1288C; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, p. 57.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

Church without the word "apostolic," but beginning with the third session the minutes, almost without exception, address them as "legates of the apostolic see."¹⁰³

The legate Philip seems to have insisted strongly on the apostolicity of the see of Rome. On two occasions he tried to depict St. Peter as the source of this apostolicity, calling him the head of the apostles, the column of the faith, and the basis of the Catholic Church, and emphasizing the most holy, and most saintly Pope Celestine as his successor.¹⁰⁴

The Fathers did not acquiesce too readily to this new practice.¹⁰⁵ Only Memnon of Ephesus acknowledged the legates as representatives of the apostolic see of the great city of Rome.¹⁰⁶ Cyril of Alexandria, in his resumé of the deposition made by the legates,¹⁰⁷ declared that, as legates, they were representatives of the apostolic see. But, in his letter to the Emperors, ¹⁰⁸ Cyril reverts to the old custom of calling the Pope simply Bishop of the great city of Rome, though he does not forget to call Alexandria, at the same time, the great city.

Juvenal of Jerusalem soon became aware of the possibilities of the new situation, and proceeded to exploit the idea to his own advantage. When criticizing the attitude of John of Antioch, he declared¹⁰⁹ that the Bishop should have appeared before the synod and "before the apostolic see of the great city of Rome, which is sitting with us, and should give honor to the apostolic [holder] of the Church of God in Jerusalem." Thus he suggested that, in accordance with an old tradition, Antioch should be judged by Jerusalem.

It is surprising that St. Cyril, in his numerous letters, did not

¹⁰³ Mansi, *ibid.*, cols. 1293, 1296, 1297, 1300, 1304; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, pp. 13, 59, 60, 61, 63 (only Philip signs the letter of the synod to the clergy of Constantinople as "priest of the Church of the Apostles," the two others contenting themselves with the titles of legates), *ibid.*, cols. 1325, 1329, 1364; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, pp. 26, 30.

¹⁰⁴ Mansi, *ibid.*, cols. 1289C, especially 1296B,C: Celestine Peter's διάδοχος καὶ τοποτηρητής . . . ; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, pp. 58, 60.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Mansi, *ibid.*, cols. 1289, 1293, 1296; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, pp. 58-61.

¹⁰⁶ Mansi, *ibid.*, col. 1293C; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, p. 39.

¹⁰⁷ Mansi, *ibid.*, col. 1300B; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, p. 62.

¹⁰⁸ Mansi, *ibid.*, cols. 1301 seq.; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, p. 63.

¹⁰⁹ Mansi, *ibid.*, col. 1312E; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, p. 18.

APOSTOLICITY BEFORE CHALCEDON

make use of the apostolic character of his see in order to impress his correspondents, and to persuade them to accept his advice and his teaching more readily. The apostolic origin of the see of Alexandria was certainly not forgotten; at least one of Cyril's correspondents was well aware of it. This was Alypius, priest of the church of the Holy Apostles in the Imperial City of Constantinople, who in his letter to Cyril,¹¹⁰ exalts the Bishop's steadfastness in defense of the true faith, and recalls the deeds of Cyril's predecessor St. Athanasius in his defense of orthodoxy against Arianism. "Through his valiant struggles," Alypius tells us, "Athanasius had exalted to the highest degree the holy see of St. Mark, the Evangelist, and Cyril was following in his footsteps." In view of these remarks, it is the more surprising that in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus there is not one allusion to this prerogative of the Alexandrian see.

It has been shown that, in spite of the insistence of the Roman legates, the new title so eloquently expressive of the apostolic origin and character of the see of Rome was accepted only in a limited way and without enthusiasm by the Eastern Church. This cannot, however, be interpreted as betraying any lack of respect for the Roman see.

The fact that the Easterners applied the title "apostolic" sparingly to their own sees, and that the holders of such sees alluded very occasionally to their venerable character, without attributing to it any special value, shows that the idea of apostolicity had, in general, not yet achieved prominence among them, and that the traditional practice of adaptation to the political division of the Empire continued to find more appreciation in Church organization than did the idea of apostolicity.

This attitude prevailed also in the East after the Council of Ephesus. The struggle between Constantinople and Alexandria continued after Cyril's death, and reached a new degree of violence at the second Council of Ephesus (449)—the ill-famed *Latrocinium* or "Robber" synod. This synod marked a new triumph for Alexandria, for at the

¹¹⁰ Cyrillus, *Epistolae*, PG 77, col. 148B: τούτοις τοῖς ἀθλοῖς τὸν στέφανον τοῦ μαρτυρίου ἐαυτῷ πλέξας ('Αθανάσιος) . . . τὸν ἅγιον τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ Μάρκου θρόνον ὑψώσεν· οἷς καὶ αὐτὸς χρησάμενος, κατόπιν ἐκείνου τοῦ ἀγίου περιεπάτησας.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

instigation of Dioscorus of Alexandria, the synod deposed Flavian, Bishop of Constantinople, although he enjoyed, this time, the support of Rome.

It is particularly noteworthy that in the Acts of the *Latrocinium* of Ephesus, wherein Dioscorus vociferously emphasized the importance and prestige of Alexandria, no allusion to the apostolicity of his see is to be found. He boldly assumed the presidency of the synod, and, in order to humiliate Constantinople, placed the highest prelates in order of seniority. The papal legate Julius was allotted second place, the Patriarch of Jerusalem third, the Bishop of Antioch fourth, and the Bishop of Constantinople last place.¹¹¹

This, however, does not mean that the principle of apostolic origin was completely forgotten in the East. A curious echo of it is to be found in the Coptic biography of the Patriarch Dioscorus. The biographer, recalling Dioscorus' manoeuvres against Flavian of Constantinople, is well aware that in this instance the Bishop of Alexandria was fighting not only the upstart Bishop of the new Imperial City, but also the Bishop of Old Rome. He summarizes the situation in a very singular way, speculating that perhaps Mark was greater than Peter.¹¹² Here is an interesting indication that the idea of apostolic origin of the principal sees, though differing in conception from that of Rome, still existed among the Easterners.

This dissimilarity between the Eastern and Western ideas of apostolicity is the more remarkable in that Pope Leo, in his letter of 445 to Dioscorus, written prior to the *Latrocinium*, reminded the Bishop of Alexandria of the tradition of St. Peter common to both Churches. He said:¹¹³ "We must think and do one thing, namely that, as we read we are of one heart, we be found to be of one soul.

¹¹¹ Mansi, 6, col. 608.

¹¹² F. Haase, "Patriarch Dioskur I. nach monophysitischen Quellen," in Max Sdrlek, *Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen*, 6 (1907), p. 204.

¹¹³ *Epistola IX ad Dioscurum Alexandrinum*, introduction, Mansi, 5, col. 1140: *Cum enim beatissimus Petrus apostolicum a Domino acceperit principatum, et Romana ecclesia in ejus permaneat institutis, nefas est credere, quod sanctus discipulus ejus Marcus qui Alexandrinam primus Ecclesiam gubernavit, aliis regulis traditionum suarum decreta formaverit: cum sine dubio de eodem fonte gratiae unus spiritus et discipuli fuerit et magistri, nec aliud ordinatus tradere potuerit, quam quod ab ordinatore suscepit. Non ergo patimur, ut cum unius nos esse corporis et fides fateamur, in aliquo discrepemus; et alia doctoris, alia discipuli instituta videantur.*

APOSTOLICITY BEFORE CHALCEDON

Because, as the most blessed Peter received from the Lord the apostolic principate, and as the Roman Church remains faithful to his institutions, it would be unjust to believe that his holy disciple, Mark, who was the first to govern the Church of Alexandria, would have formulated his decrees according to different rules. Without doubt the spirit of the master and the disciple was one, drawn from the same source of grace, and the ordained could not transmit anything other than what he had derived from the ordainer. We cannot thus permit that, when we confess to being of the one body and faith, we should disagree in any way, and that the institution of the teacher and the disciple should appear unlike." As has been seen, Dioscorus paid no heed to the Pope's reminder.

The idea of apostolicity seems to have been better appreciated in Antioch than in Alexandria. In 448 Domnus, Bishop of Antioch, was approached by four priests of Edessa, who accused their Bishop Ibas of Nestorianism. Domnus assembled a synod of his bishops at Antioch, but they hesitated to acquit Ibas of the accusations, because they learned that two of the accusers, instead of presenting themselves to the Fathers in Antioch, had gone to Constantinople in the belief that their complaints would be more sympathetically received at the imperial court.

When Domnus learned of the action of the two priests, he complained bitterly of their violation of ecclesiastical rules, and of their lack of reverence "for their apostolic see." This is one of the rare instances, at this period, of an Eastern see's stressing its apostolic character.¹¹⁴ It would be erroneous, however, to interpret the incident as an act of opposition, by the apostolic see of Antioch, emphasizing the non-apostolicity of the see of Constantinople. Flavian of Constantinople refused to judge the Bishop of Edessa, and the affair was settled by a commission, appointed by the Emperor Theodosius II, which assembled at Beirut and Tyre in February 449. Ibas signed a declaration which satisfied his clergy, and the latter promised in return to respect in the future the authority of their supra-metropolitan of Antioch.¹¹⁵

¹¹⁴ Mansi, 7, cols. 212-217; ed. Schwartz, t. 1. vol. 1, pt. 3, pp. 19 seq. The Acts of this synod were read during the tenth session of the Council of Chalcedon.

¹¹⁵ Mansi, *ibid.*, cols. 197-201.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

A new test for the divergent Eastern and Western views arose at the fourth Oecumenical Council held at Chalcedon in 451. This had to undo the work of the *Latrocinium*, and solemnly to condemn Dioscorus' monophysite doctrine.

It was this Council that marked the decline of Alexandria's ascendancy in the Church. Egyptian particularism precipitated this evolution. Egypt, always in opposition to Constantinople, remained predominantly faithful to the doctrine of its Patriarch, and chose to stand outside the Church, making monophysism its national religion. The place of Alexandria in the Eastern Church was taken by Constantinople, and the Council of Chalcedon was very influential in furthering the rise of that city.

The Council also, however, afforded Rome a welcome opportunity to play a leading role in the East and throughout the whole Church. This phase of the struggle between Alexandria and Constantinople was dominated by the noble figure of Pope Leo (440-461), deservedly called the Great. His voice, transmitted in the famous dogmatic letter to Flavian, dominated the debates, and his doctrinal decision earned general approval in the orthodox East. The Council of Chalcedon also contributed importantly to the development of the idea of apostolicity in the East.

It was to be expected that at the Council Leo would stress the apostolicity of his see more than his predecessor had, because under his energetic government the idea of Rome's apostolicity and primacy, which derived from Peter, had made new progress in the minds of the Westerners. Leo called his see *sedes apostolica* in almost every letter that he addressed to bishops or clerics of his patriarchate.¹¹⁶ His western correspondents also used that title for

¹¹⁶ A few examples may be quoted from Leo's correspondence before the Council of Chalcedon (Mansi, 5, cols. 1213 seq., *idem*, 6, cols. 1 seq., *PL*, 54, cols. 593 seq. In order to simplify matters only the letters and chapters are quoted). Cf. *Collectio Grimanica*, ed. E. Schwartz, t. 2, vol. 4, with different numbering of the letters. *Epist.* 1, *ad Aquilejensem ep.* chap. 2: *apost. sedis auctoritas*; 4, *ad episc. Campaniae*, chap. 2: *ap. sed. auctor.*; 5, *ad episc. Illyrici*, chap. 1: *ap. sed. auct.*, 2: *ap. dignitatis beat. Ap. Petro primum*; 6, *ad ep. Thessalon.*, chap. 2: *apost. sedes*; 10, *ad episc. Viennenses*, chap. 2: *apost. sedes*; 12, *ad ep. Africanos*, chap. 5: *ap. sedis statuta*; 13, *ad ep. Illyrici*, chap. 1: *sed. ap. auctor.*; 114, *ad Anastasium Thessalon.*, chap. 11: *ad unam Petri sedem universalis ecclesiae cura*; 16, *ad ep. Siciliae*, chap. 1: *b. Petri ap. sedes*, chap. 7: *apost. sedes*; 19, *Doro Beneventano*, chap. 1: *ap. sedes*; 61, *ad Martinum et Faustum presb.*: *ap. sedis auctor.*

APOSTOLICITY BEFORE CHALCEDON

the Roman see, regarding it as "The Apostolic See," and addressing the Pope simply as *apostolatus vester*.¹¹⁷

Another striking illustration of the spread of the idea of apostolicity in the West was the constitution concerning ordinations by Hilarius, Bishop of Arles, issued by the Emperor Valentinian III in Rome (8 July 445). This contains the following words, which sound as if they emanated from the lips of the Pope himself:¹¹⁸

"Thus, because the primacy of the apostolic see, the great virtue of Saint Peter, who is the Prince of the episcopal crown, the dignity of the Roman city, and also the authority of the synod had confirmed this, let none presume to attempt anything illicit, which would be devoid of the authority of that see. The peace of the Churches will be preserved everywhere [only] when the universe acknowledges its rector."

The Emperor says further that Hilarius had acted "against the majesty of the *imperium* and against the reverence of the apostolic see," and, he continues, no-one should dare to change established traditions without the authority of the venerable Pope of the Eternal City. "But what the authority of the apostolic see has or shall sanction, this should be law to all of them."

Concluding this survey, it will be interesting to examine, in more detail, the letters sent by Leo to his Eastern correspondents before the Council of Chalcedon, in order to learn something of the impression made on them by his constant reiteration of the idea of apostolicity.

In Leo's letters to the deposed Bishop Flavian of Constantinople, the Emperor Theodosius, and the Empress Pulcheria, Rome's apostolic character was referred to but casually. The *sedes apostolica* was mentioned only in the letter to the Emperor and in two letters

¹¹⁷ For example *Epist. 3, Paschasinus ad Leonem*, chap. 1: *apostolicus papa, apostolatus vester*, chap. 2: *apostolatus vester*; *Epist. 65, Arelatenses ad Leonem*, chap. 1: *ap. sedes, apostolatus vester*, chap. 2: *apost. sedes*, chap. 3: *ap. sedis mandata*; *Epist. 68, Ep. Gallorum ad Leonem*; *apostolica cura, ap. sedes, principatus sedis apost.*; *Epist. 97, Eusebii Mediolan. ad Leonem*, chap. 1: *in Apostoli sede praesul*.

¹¹⁸ Mansi, 5, cols. 1153 seq: *Cum igitur Sedis apostolicae primatum sancti Petri meritum, qui princeps est episcopalis coronae, et Romanae dignitas civitatis, sacrae etiam Synodi firmitate auctoritas, ne quid praeter auctoritatem sedis istius inlicitum praesumptio attentare nitatur...*

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

to Pulcheria,¹¹⁹ but in the letter to the second synod of Ephesus, Leo spoke of "the authority of the apostolic see," and used the confession of Peter (Matt. 16: 13, 16) as his principal argument against Entyches' doctrine.¹²⁰

When the second Council of Ephesus developed into a *Latrocinium*, Leo made a great effort to persuade the Emperor Theodosius to convoke a new synod, if possible in Italy, in order to undo the evil wrought by Dioscorus. He did not succeed in convincing Theodosius, although he had managed to get the support of the Empresses for his plan, and he achieved his aim only when Marcian became Emperor. In this correspondence, Leo, in his anxiety to impress the Emperors and to obtain the decision he sought, invoked the apostolic authority of the Roman see more frequently.¹²¹

Leo's efforts to exalt the apostolicity of the Roman See in his contact with the East made some impression there, but he won his most important success in Constantinople itself. The Patriarch Flavian, deposed by the *Latrocinium*, appealed to the "most religious and saintly Father and Archbishop Leo."¹²² He confessed that circumstances obliged him "to make use of the apostolic appeal to your holiness," and, after describing the injustice done to him, he disclosed that when he had pleaded about this "to the throne of the apostolic see of the Prince of the Apostles, Peter, and to the universal synod which is under your Holiness," he had been confined to his dwelling by soldiers, who cut off all means of communication.

¹¹⁹ *Epist.* 24, *ad Theodosium*, chap. 1: *sedes apost.*; *Epist.* 30, *Pulcheriae Aug.*, chap. 1: *apost. sedis moderatio*; *Epist.* 36, *ad Pulcheriam*, chap. 3: *ap. sedis moderatio*.

¹²⁰ *Epist.* 33, *S. Synodo*, chap. 1: *auctoritas sedis apost.*

¹²¹ *Epist.* 43, *ad Theodos.* The Pope insists that he received from St. Peter the power to promote true faith and peace. Cf. also *Epist.* 44, chap. 1: *beata Petri sedes, sedes apost.* *Epist.* 45, *ad Pulcheriam*, chap. 2: *sedes b. Petri*, chap. 3: *pietas tua . . . supplicationem nostram apud clementissimum principem, sibi specialiter beatissimo Petro apostolo legatione commissa, dignetur asserere.* *Epist.* 83, *ad Marcianum*, chap. 2, *Epist.* 84, *ad Pulcheriam*, chap. 3, *Epist.* 85, *ad Anatolium*, chap. 2.

¹²² See the critical publication of the text by Th. E. Mommsen in *Neues Archiv*, 11 (1886), pp. 362-364 ("Actenstücke zur Kirchengeschichte aus dem cod. Cap. Novar. 30"): *Oportuit quidem ad praesens tempus me dignanter referre et uti apostolica appellatione ad vestram sanctitatem . . . Me appellante thronum apostolicae sedis principis apostolorum Petri et universam beatam quae sub vestra sanctitate est synodum, statim me circumvallat multitudo militaris, et volente me ad sanctum altare confugere non concessit . . .*

APOSTOLICITY BEFORE CHALCEDON

Bishop Eusebius of Dorylaeum was condemned by the *Latrocinium*, at the same time as Flavian, and exiled. He managed to escape to Rome whither he had sent an appeal couched in terms similar to those used by Flavian. The Bishop addressed his appeal in words which seem to reflect the Roman conception of apostolicity:¹²³ *Curavit desuper et ab exordio consuevit thronus apostolicus iniqua perferentes defensare....* But, because the text of the letter is known only in its Latin translation, care should be taken in the interpretation of this expression; for it could have been adapted to the Roman view by the translator.¹²⁴ Nevertheless, it is safe to suppose that the Bishop called the Roman see "apostolic."

Leo's invocations of Peter's apostolic authority made an even more profound impression on the Empresses: Galla Placidia, the mother of Valentinian III, and Eudoxia, Theodosius' daughter and Valentinian's wife. In their letters to Theodosius II they have given us a very eloquent account of the pious pontiff's solicitude for the restoration of peace in the Church in the anxious days after the *Latrocinium*.

Theodosius' Aunt, Galla Placidia,¹²⁵ in her letter to her nephew first recalls the visit she made to the tomb of St. Peter in Rome, and writes how Leo, after praying at the Apostle's tomb had implored her, in the name of the Prince of the Apostles, to intercede with her nephew. She then recounts how Flavian was molested for sending an appeal "to the apostolic see," and asks Theodosius to restore the true faith "according to the form and definition of the apostolic see."

Valentinian's mother addressed a letter to Theodosius' sister, the Empress Pulcheria,¹²⁶ recalling the same touching scene at the tomb of St. Peter, and imploring Pulcheria to use her influence with her brother so that "all that which had been decided in that tumultuous

¹²³ Published by Th. E. Mommsen, *ibid.*, pp. 364-367.

¹²⁴ Cf. P. Batiffol, *Le siège apostolique*, pp. 315 seq., and *idem.*, *Cathedra Petri*, p. 162.

¹²⁵ *Epist.* 56; cf. also *Epist.* 57, of Eudoxia, the daughter of Theodosius who recalls similar impressions, Mansi 6, cols. 51 seq.; ed. E. Schwartz, t. 2, vol. 3, pt. 1, pp. 14, 15 (Latin text).

¹²⁶ *Epist.* 58, Mansi, 6, col. 57C: Πάντων ἀκεραίων μερόντων, εἰς τὸν ἀποστολικὸν θρόνον, ἐν ᾧ πρῶτος ὁ μακαριώτατος τῶν ἀποστόλων Πέτρος, τὰ κλεῖθρα τῶν οὐρανῶν ὑποδεξάμενος, τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην ἐκόσμησε ...; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, p. 13. Greek text, *ibid.*, t. 2, vol. 1, pt. 1, p. 50.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

and horrible synod may be rescinded by all means, and that when all has been restored to its original state, the cause of the clergy should be sent to the apostolic see in which the first of the apostles, the most blessed Peter, who had received the keys of heaven, held the principate of the priesthood." She continued, "We must accord first place in everything to the Eternal City, which through its own virtue was chosen for the domination of the whole world, and which had entrusted the whole world to our *basileia* to be ruled and preserved."

Placidia spoke similarly of Rome in her letter to Theodosius also. She wrote of the prominent position of Rome that prompted innumerable bishops from other parts of Italy to visit the city, and gather around Leo. In this apostolic throne she said, "the first one [of the apostles] who was held worthy to be given the keys of heaven had adorned the principate of the archepiscopacy. It is indeed meet for us to preserve our reverence in everything for this city, which is the greatest, and the mistress of all lands."¹²⁷

This passage of Placidia's letter to Theodosius and the concluding words, quoted earlier, from her letter to Pulcheria are particularly eloquent. Unintentionally the Empress combined in these interesting passages the two reasons for which the see of Rome was given the primacy: its apostolicity, originating with St. Peter, the first of the apostles, and its leading role in the formation of the Roman Empire, to which the Byzantine *basileia* was heir.

There was yet another Easterner whose conception of apostolicity approximated that of Rome; he was Theodoret, Bishop of Kyrros.¹²⁸ In a letter, written after the *Latrocinium*, Theodoret recalls that just as Paul went to Peter in order to obtain a decision in the controversy at Antioch about the validity of Mosaic prescriptions for converts from paganism, "so we humble and poor men have recourse to your see which is apostolic, in order to obtain from you a medicament to heal the ulcers of the Churches." Then he speaks of the advantages which the city of Rome enjoys, and for which it is so

¹²⁷ Mansi, 6, *Epist* 56, cols. 52, 53A: ἐν ᾧ πρῶτος ἐκεῖνος, ὁ τὰς οὐρανοῦ κλεῖς ἀξιώθεις ὑποδέξασθαι, τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν τῆς ἀρχιερωσύνης ἐκόσμησε δηλαδὴ· ὅποτε πρέπει ἡμᾶς ταύτῃ τῇ μεγίστῃ πόλει, ἣ τις δέσποινα πασῶν ὑπάρχει τῶν γεῶν, ἐν πᾶσι τὸ σέβας παραφυλάξαι; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, p. 15 (latin text).

¹²⁸ *Epist.* 52, *Theodoriti ad Leonem*, especially chaps. 1, 5, Mansi, 6, col. 36, 40.

APOSTOLICITY BEFORE CHALCEDON

famous, these being, its great size, its beauty, and its large population. He goes on to say that it is the most noble and celebrated of all cities, and that it governs the whole world; that it gave its name to the subjects over which it extended its dominion; but that its greatest ornament was the true faith, which it received from its teachers, Peter and Paul, whose tombs it also possessed. "These two made your see that most noble of all. This see is the apogee of all your happiness. The Lord has illuminated your see again, now that he has placed your holiness there to irradiate the true faith."

After recounting all the evil that had been done in Ephesus, the Bishop, who was deprived of his see, exclaims: "I thus expect a sentence from your throne which is apostolic, and I pray and implore your holiness to grant me a just and true judgment, and to order me to come to you and disclose to you my teaching, which follows in the footsteps of the apostles."

In this eloquent missive ideas on the primacy of Rome, similar to those expressed by the Empress Placidia, can again be found. It is not only—declares the letter—by virtue of its apostolic origin, derived from the Prince of the Apostles, that Rome was regarded as the first city in the Christian world, but also because it was, and still is, in some sense, the capital of an Empire to which it gave its name. All of this shows how difficult it was for the Easterners to forget a principle which had for so long been the basis of Church organization. On the other hand, although Theodoret closely approaches the Roman conception of apostolicity, he does not call Rome The Apostolic See, as it is called by the Westerners, but only the see which is apostolic. Nevertheless, it is evident that the idea of apostolicity had made some progress, at least among some Easterners, during the years between the *Latrocinium*, and the Council of Chalcedon.¹²⁹

The greatest contest between the Roman and Byzantine conception of apostolicity took place during the Council of Chalcedon itself.

¹²⁹ It should be recorded that Theodoret also calls the see of Antioch apostolic in a letter addressed to Bishop Domnus (Theodoretus, *Epist.* 112; *PG*, 83, col. 1309).

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

In his letter to the Synod, Leo was not too insistent about the apostolic character of his see, but he recalled that the invitation to the Roman Bishop to attend the Council had been sent by the Emperor Marcian, and that it had been accepted by Leo, with the reservation that the right and honor of the throne of the most blessed Apostle Peter, be respected.¹³⁰ He also announced that the Bishops Paschasinus and Lucentius, and the priests Boniface and Basil, would represent "The Apostolic See."

The legates needed no reminder to stress, in the presence of the Fathers, the prominent apostolic character of the Roman see. This custom had already become such a habit to all Westerners that they could not have disregarded it. Bishop Paschasinus gave full vent to the Roman belief at the beginning of the first session.¹³¹ Announced as the legate "of The Apostolic See," he declared: "We hold in our hands the orders of the most blessed and apostolic Bishop of the city of the Romans which is the head of all Churches." Lucentius came to the aid of his colleagues declaring that Dioscorus had dared to convoke a synod "without the authority of the apostolic see which had never happened before, and should never happen again." Then Paschasinus, "legate of the apostolic see," continued: "We are not allowed to run counter to the precepts of the most blessed and apostolic Pope who governs the apostolic see."

From that moment whenever the legates asked permission to speak, they were announced by the clerks as "vicars of the apostolic see."¹³² They must have informed the "chef de protocol" that they wished to be introduced in that way, but this does not seem to have been the procedure first adopted, for whenever the minutes of the sessions describe the legates' interventions, they are called simply bishops or vicars of the Bishop of Ancient Rome.¹³³ Also, in the list of imperial functionaries and bishops present at the beginning of each session, they are invariably called only vicars of the most

¹³⁰ Mansi, 6, *Epist.* 93, cols. 131 seq.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, cols. 580, 581; ed. E. Schwartz, t. 2, vol. 1, pt. 1, pp. 65, 66.

¹³² Mansi, *ibid.*, cols. 680, 976, 984, 1045; 7, cols. 8, 9, 32, 52, 57, 60, 101, 105, 181, 189, 257, 261, 270, 289, 296, 297, 425, ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, pp. 114; pt. 2, pp. 3, 8, 28, 93, 94, 111, 113, 114, 123, 125; pt. 3, pp. 5, 10, 38, 39, 51, 53, 54, 87.

¹³³ Mansi, 6, cols. 608, 613, 692, 940, 988, 1020, 1036, 1041, 1044; 7, col. 300; ed. Schwartz, t. 2, vol. 1, pt. 1, pp. 78, 82, 120; pt. 2, pp. 9, 10, 11, 24, 27.

APOSTOLICITY BEFORE CHALCEDON

blessed Leo, Bishop of Ancient Rome.¹³⁴ In their addresses the legates seldom neglected to emphasize the apostolic character of the Roman see, and they sometimes referred to Leo as simply *apostolicus*.¹³⁵ The titles which they give their master when signing the synodal decisions in his name are also eloquent.¹³⁶

In general, in the minutes of the debates, the chancellery of Anatolius of Constantinople followed the traditional Byzantine custom of giving to the Pope the simple title of "the most reverend, most holy Bishop of Ancient Rome." In this respect the patriarchal chancellery followed the rules established by its imperial counterpart. The Emperor Theodosius, for example, in his letters to Valentinian and in his answers to the letters of Placidia and Eudoxia, called the Pope "the most reverend Patriarch Leo."¹³⁷ Marcian, when he wrote announcing his intention to convoke a new synod, addressed his letter "to the most reverend Bishop of the most glorious city of Rome," and was content to call the Pope, "Your Holiness." The same address and titles can be read in the letter of the Empress Pulcheria.¹³⁸

There are, however, two exceptions symptomatic of progress in this regard. In his allocution to the Fathers during the sixth session the Emperor, mentioning Leo's dogmatic letter to Flavian, speaks of "the holy [man] Leo, Pope of the city of Rome, who governs the apostolic see."¹³⁹ In the letter in which the Emperor Marcian

¹³⁴ Mansi, 6, cols. 565, 940, 977 (only here is the apostolic see of the Romans especially mentioned); 7, cols. 4, 97, 117, 180, 185, 193, 272, 301, 313, 424; ed. E. Schwartz, t. 2, vol. 1, pt. 1, p. 56; pt. 2, pp. 70, 85, 121, 130; pt. 3, pp. 3, 11, 42, 56, 63, 86.

¹³⁵ Mansi, 6, cols. 680C: τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἐπισκόπου Ῥώμης; 7, cols. 101, 257; ed. E. Schwartz, t. 2, vol. 1, pt. 1, p. 114; pt. 2, p. 123; pt. 3, p. 38.

¹³⁶ At the end of the third session, after the condemnation of Dioscorus (Mansi, 6, col. 1080), simply Paschasinus ... ἐπέχων τὸν τόπον τοῦ ἀρχιεπισκόπου τῆς μεγάλης Ῥώμης Λέοντος... but, at the end of the sixth session (*idem.*, 7, col. 136): ἐπέχων τὸν τόπον τοῦ δεσπότη μου τοῦ μακαριωτάτου καὶ ἀποστολικοῦ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐκκλησίας ἐπισκόπου πόλεως Ῥώμης Λέοντος.... The Latin translation of the first passage added the words: *atque apostolicae universalis ecclesiae papae*. Cf. ed. E. Schwartz, t. 2, vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 34; pt. 3, p. 141.

¹³⁷ *Lit.* 62, 63, 64. Mansi, *ibid.*, cols. 68, 69, 72; *PL*, 54, cols. 876, 878.

¹³⁸ *Lit.* 76, 77. Mansi, *ibid.*, cols. 97, 101, *PL*, 54, cols. 904, 906.

¹³⁹ Mansi, 7, col. 130: ἡ τοῦ θεοφιλεστάτου Λέοντος τοῦ τῆς βασιλίδος Ῥώμης ἀρχιεπισκόπου τοῦ τὸν ἀποστολικὸν θρόνον κυβερνῶντος ἐπιστολή ...; ed. E. Schwartz, t. 2, vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 140.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

announces the decisions of the Council to the Pope, and asks him to accept canon twenty-eight giving the second position in the Church to Constantinople, he calls the Pope "Father," and "Your Holiness," and terms his see "apostolic."¹⁴⁰

There were also some bishops and clerics who, during the debates at Chalcedon, did not hesitate to speak at times of the apostolicity of the Roman see. Anatolius of Constantinople was impressed by this, and on the very solemn occasion of pronouncing sentence on Dioscorus, he declared, after Paschasinus had announced the Pope's condemnation:¹⁴¹ "Being in every way of like opinion with the apostolic throne, I, too, endorse the condemnation of Dioscorus."

This expression was particularly outstanding because, during the third session, when the Fathers, after listening to the letters of St. Cyril and of the Pope censuring Eutyches, spoke of their respect for Leo, their acclamations¹⁴² did not evoke a similar response: "We all believe so, Pope Leo believes so This is the faith of Archbishop Leo. Leo believes so, Leo and Anatolius believe so Archbishop Leo thinks so, believes so, writes so"

It is interesting to read the pronouncements of other bishops recording their approval of the condemnation of Dioscorus during the third session. Among the one hundred and eighty-eight bishops listed in the Latin Acts as having pronounced their decision after Anatolius, only nine mentioned in their declarations that they were joining the judgment of the apostolic see of Rome. They were Seleucus, Metropolitan of Amasia, Francion, Metropolitan of Philippopolis, Peter, Metropolitan of Gangrae, Daniel, Bishop of Cadena, Thomas of Theodosiopolis, Cecropius of Sebastopolis, Acacius of Ariaratheia, and Renus of Ionopolis.¹⁴³ Of the others, twenty-two bishops mentioned the name of Leo in their speeches

¹⁴⁰ *Lit.* 100, *Marcionis ad Leonem*, chap. 3. Mansi, 6, col. 167A; *PL*, 54, col. 974B; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, p. 55.

¹⁴¹ Mansi, *ibid.*, col. 1048C: τὰ αὐτὰ τῷ ἀποστολικῷ θρόνῳ διὰ πάντων φρονῶν, σύμψηρος καὶ γὼ γίνομαι ἐπὶ τῇ καθαιρέσει Διοσκόρου; ed. E. Schwartz, t. 2, vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 29.

¹⁴² Mansi, *ibid.*, col. 960; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, p. 81.

¹⁴³ Mansi, *ibid.*, cols. 1051, 1054, 1062, 1069, 1072; ed. E. Schwartz, t. 2, vol. 3, pt. 2, pp. 49, 51, 58, 63, 65.

APOSTOLICITY BEFORE CHALCEDON

recording the sentence, calling him simply Bishop of the Great and Old Rome.¹⁴⁴

On a similar occasion, at the beginning of the fourth session, when the Fathers were asked to express their opinions regarding Leo's dogmatic letter to Flavian, most of them mentioned Leo in the declarations, but none of them cared to add that his see was apostolic.¹⁴⁵

Special attention is due to the *libelli*, despatched to the Pope and the Council by some Alexandrian clerics – the deacons Theodore and Ischyron, the priest Athanasius, and the layman Sophronius – containing accusations against their Bishop, Dioscorus. All the *libelli* are addressed “to the most holy and most beloved of God, oecumenical Archbishop, and Patriarch of the great city of Rome, and to the holy and universal synod of Chalcedon.” In them the Alexandrians reveal a surprisingly high respect for the Pope, calling him oecumenical Archbishop and Patriarch. This is, perhaps, the first use of this title which was later adopted by the patriarchs of Constantinople. The apostolic character of the Roman see, however, was recognized specifically only by the deacon Theodore.¹⁴⁶

It should be noted that in two passages of his *libellus*, Theodore's colleague Ischyron calls the see of Alexandria “the evangelic see.”¹⁴⁷ He must, therefore, have been fully conscious of the apostolic origin of Alexandria, although he ignores the fact that Rome, too, was of apostolic origin.

¹⁴⁴ Mansi, *ibid.*, col. 1047: Maximus of Antioch, col. 1049: Diogenes of Cyzicus, Julian of Coe, Peter of Corinth, col. 1050: Theodor of Tarsus, Roman of Myra, col. 1051: Constantine of Militene, John of Sebastia, col. 1052: Constantine of Bostra, Patricius of Tyana, col. 1054: Florentius of Sardes, Photius of Tyre, col. 1056: Julian of Hypepa, col. 1059: Paul of Philomelion, col. 1060: Indimus of Irenopolis, col. 1061: Eutropius of Adardos, col. 1065: John of Alinda, col. 1066: Eorticius of Nicopolis, col. 1068: Paulinus of Apamea, col. 1079: Antiochus of Sinope, col. 1080: Theodorus of Claudiopolis; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, pp. 47–51, 53, 55, 56, 59, 61, 62, 71.

¹⁴⁵ Mansi, 7, cols. 9–28; ed. E. Schwartz, t. 2, vol. 1, pt. 2, pp. 93–101.

¹⁴⁶ Mansi, 6, cols. 1005, 1012, 1020, 1021, 1029: τῷ ἁγιωτάτῳ καὶ θεοφιλεστάτῳ οἰκουμενικῷ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ καὶ πατριάρχῃ τῆς μεγάλης Ῥώμης Λέοντι, καὶ τῇ ἁγίᾳ καὶ οἰκουμενικῇ συνόδῳ τῇ ἐν Χαλκεδόνι...; Theodoret's *Libellus*, col. 1009A: κατὰ τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου καὶ δσιωτάτου ἀποστολικοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγάλης Ῥώμης; ed. E. Schwartz, t. 2, vol. 1, pt. 2, pp. 15, 17, 20, 23.

¹⁴⁷ Mansi, *ibid.*, cols. 1013A, 1016B: τοῦ εὐαγγελικοῦ ἐκείνου θρόνου ... Κυρίλλου, τοῦ τὸν εὐαγγελικὸν θρόνον διακοσμήσαντος ...; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, pp. 17, 18.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

That the importance of the idea of apostolicity, held in such high esteem in Rome, should meet with so little understanding in the East is not surprising when the habits of the Easterners, as revealed in the Acts, are taken into account. They almost completely disregarded the apostolic character of their own Churches, such as those of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, and called the heads of these Churches simply bishops or archbishops of the cities (or great cities) of Alexandria or Antioch. Constantinople, however, was often called the Imperial City and New Rome.

One detail perhaps deserves special mention. Although Constantinople was the imperial residence, and thus fully deserved to be called the Imperial City, some bishops in their declaration called Rome also the Imperial City. At the close of their acclamation during the second session, the senators demanded:¹⁴⁸ "Let the letter of the most holy Archbishop of the Imperial and Ancient City of Rome, Leo, be made known."

Maximus of Antioch, who followed Anatolius, who had been given the title of "Archbishop of the Imperial City of Constantinople, which is the New Rome," did not, at the third session, imitate Anatolius by calling Rome an apostolic see; but in referring to Leo, he named him *pater noster Leo regiae senioris urbis Romae*.¹⁴⁹ At this same session, Theodore of Claudopolis mentioned both imperial cities in his declaration – *decreta a . . . sanctissimo archiepiscopo regiae urbis Romae Leone . . . et a sanctissimo archiepiscopo regiae urbis novae Constantinopolitano Anatolio*.¹⁵⁰

Maximus of Antioch appeared to be consistent in styling Rome the "Imperial City," for he used the same expression during the fourth session when he announced to Flavian his agreement with Leo's letter.¹⁵¹ His attitude was the more significant in that he was fully aware of the apostolic origin of his own episcopal see.

During the seventh session of the Council, when the question of dividing the provinces of Antioch between that metropolis and

¹⁴⁸ Mansi, *ibid.*, col. 960C: ἀναγινωσθέσθω ἡ ἐπιστολὴ τοῦ ὁσιωτάτου ἀρχιεπισκόπου τῆς βασιλίδος καὶ πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης Λέοντος; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, p. 81.

¹⁴⁹ Mansi, *ibid.*, col. 1048D; ed. E. Schwartz, t. 2, vol. 3, pt. 2, p. 47.

¹⁵⁰ Mansi, *ibid.*, col. 1080B; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, p. 71.

¹⁵¹ Mansi, *ibid.*, 7, col. 12B: ἡ ἐπιστολὴ τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου ἀρχιεπισκόπου τῆς βασιλευούσης Ῥώμης Λέοντος; ed. E. Schwartz, t. 2, vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 94.

APOSTOLICITY BEFORE CHALCEDON

Jerusalem was to be considered, Maximus of Antioch opened the discussion with the following words:¹⁵² "It is agreeable to me and to the most reverend Bishop Juvenalius, in accordance with a mutual agreement reached after considerable contention, that the see of the great city of the Antiochenes, that of Saint Peter, should have the two provinces of Phoenicia and Arabia, and the see of Jerusalem, should have the provinces of the three Palestines."

In this connection the letter of the Empress-Mother, Placidia, to Theodosius II and to his sister Pulcheria is worth recalling. All this seems to indicate that, in the minds of the Byzantines, their Empire had two capitals – Old Rome and New Rome – each the object of their veneration; the first because of its past, the second because it was actually the residence of the emperors; they were fully aware too of their debt to Old Rome, which had given its name to their Empire, and in this it is evident that the traditional principle of adapting Church organization to the political division of the Empire was still applied to Rome also. Its primacy in the Church remained guaranteed in the eyes of many because it was the first capital of their Empire and would so remain as long as the Roman Empire, of which Constantinople was now the Imperial City, endured.

This consideration may assume greater importance when the changes in Church organization made by the Council of Chalcedon for the benefit of the bishops of Constantinople are examined. These changes were voted after the conclusion of the dogmatic discussions, and after the adoption of twenty-seven canons, in a session in which only 185 bishops participated. Most of them were prelates of dioceses whose fate remained to be decided. The Roman legates abstained from attending this meeting, pleading that they had no relevant instructions.

The canon voted by the Fathers is called the twenty-eighth canon, although the manuscripts of Greek and Latin texts of the Council enumerate only twenty-seven. The twenty-eighth canon of the

¹⁵² Mansi, *ibid.*, col. 180D: ὥστε τὸν μὲν θρόνον τῆς Ἀντιοχείων μεγαλοπόλεως τὸν τοῦ ἁγίου Πέτρου; ed. E. Schwartz, t. 2, vol. 1, pt. 3, p. 5.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

Council of Chalcedon¹⁵³ appeared for the first time at the end of the sixth century in Byzantine collections of canon law, in the *Syntagma* of Fourteen Titles.

It has been seen that the canons of the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Councils regarding ecclesiastical organization were not clearly formulated. This accounts for the numerous controversies among specialists in explaining them, and the same holds true for the so-called canon twenty-eight of the Council of Chalcedon. Here is the wording of the canon:¹⁵⁴

"Following in all things the decisions of the Holy Fathers and taking cognizance of the canon of the 150 bishops beloved by God, who assembled in the Imperial City of Constantinople, under the former Emperor, the great Theodosius of happy memory, we decide and determine the same concerning the rights of honor of the holy Church of the same Constantinople, the New Rome. For the Fathers acknowledged the rights of honor of the throne of the Old Rome, because it was the Imperial City, and moved by the same motives, the 150 bishops beloved of God have attributed the same rights of honor to the most holy throne of the New Rome in that they rightly judged that the city, which is honored by the presence of

¹⁵³ Cf. E. Schwartz, "Der sechste nicaenische Kanon auf der Synode von Chalkedon," *Sitzungsber. der Preuss. Akad. der Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl.*, 27 (1930), pp. 612 seq.

¹⁵⁴ Mansi, 7, col. 428, ed; E. Schwartz, t. 2, vol. 1, pt. 3, pp. 88 seq: Πανταχοῦ τοῖς τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ὁροῖς ἐπόμενοι καὶ τὸν ἀρτίως ἀναγνωσθέντα κανόνα τῶν ῥν θεοφιλεστάτων ἐπισκόπων τῶν συναχθέντων ἐπὶ τοῦ εὐσεβοῦς τὴν μνήμην μεγάλου Θεοδοσίου τοῦ γενομένου βασιλέως ἐν τῇ βασιλίδι Κωνσταντινουπόλει νέᾳ Ῥώμῃ γνωρίζοντες, τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ ἡμεῖς ὀρίζομεν τε καὶ ψηφίζομεθα περὶ τῶν πρεσβείων τῆς ἁγιωτάτης ἐκκλησίας τῆς αὐτῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως νέας Ῥώμης. Καὶ γὰρ τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην οἱ πατέρες εἰκότως ἀποδεδώκασιν τὰ πρεσβεῖα καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ σκοπῷ κινούμενοι οἱ ῥν θεοφιλέστατοι ἐπίσκοποι τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεῖα ἀπένειμαν τῷ τῆς νέας Ῥώμης ἁγιωτάτῳ θρόνῳ, εὐλόγως κρίναντες τὴν βασιλεία καὶ συγκλήτῳ τιμηθεῖσαν πόλιν καὶ τῶν ἴσων ἀπολαύουσιν πρεσβείων τῇ πρεσβυτέρᾳ βασιλίδι Ῥώμῃ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς ὡς ἐκείνην μεγαλύνεσθαι πράγμασιν δευτέραν μετ' ἐκείνην ὑπάρχουσιν καὶ ὥστε τοὺς τῆς Ποντικῆς καὶ τῆς Ἀσιανῆς καὶ τῆς Θρακικῆς διοικήσεως μητροπολίτας μόνους, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐν τοῖς βαρβαρικοῖς ἐπισκόπους τῶν προειρημένων διοικήσεων χειροτονεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ προειρημένου ἁγιωτάτου θρόνου τῆς κατὰ Κωνσταντινουπόλιν ἁγιωτάτης ἐκκλησίας, δηλαδὴ ἐκάστου μητροπολίτου τῶν προειρημένων διοικήσεων μετὰ τῶν τῆς ἐπαρχίας ἐπισκόπων χειροτονούντος τοὺς τῆς ἐπαρχίας ἐπισκόπους, καθὼς τοῖς θείοις κανόσι διηγόρεται· χειροτονεῖσθαι δὲ καθὼς εἴρηται, τοὺς μητροπολίτας τῶν προειρημένων διοικήσεων παρὰ τοῦ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἀρχιεπισκόπου ψηφισμάτων συμφώνων κατὰ τὸ ἔθος γινόμενων καὶ ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἀναφερομένων.

APOSTOLICITY BEFORE CHALCEDON

the emperor and the senate and enjoys [in the organization of the State] the same rights of honor as the Imperial City, the Old Rome, should also be honored in ecclesiastical affairs and should therefore occupy the second place after the Old Rome.

“Consequently the metropolitans of the dioceses of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace, and only they, and furthermore the bishops of the above-mentioned dioceses, whose sees are in the lands of the barbarians, shall be consecrated by the above-mentioned most holy throne of the most holy Church of Constantinople; while naturally each metropolitan of the above-mentioned dioceses, together with the bishops of his province, consecrates the bishops of the province, as has been laid down in the holy canon. The metropolitans of the above-mentioned dioceses shall however, as stated, be consecrated by the archbishop of Constantinople, after a harmonious election has been arranged according to usage and has been passed on to him.”

It is imperative first to examine the intentions of the Fathers when they enacted this canon. Although the stipulations of the canon concern primarily the organization of the Eastern Church, the Fathers intended to secure this time a solemn confirmation of a situation which had been developing there since 381; so it was not surprising that they were anxious to obtain the vote of a truly oecumenical council. As mentioned before, the third canon of the Council of 381 was meant to apply to the dioceses of only the eastern part of the Empire, and was not sent to the West for official approval. If the Fathers hoped that this measure would break the leadership of Alexandria in the East, events destroyed their hopes. Alexandria inflicted the greatest humiliations on Constantinople at the Synod of the Oak, and at the *Latrocinium* of Ephesus. A canon securing leadership in the East for Constantinople, and voted by the same general council that had sealed the defeat of Alexandria in doctrinal matters, would also definitively break the dangerous influence of Alexandria on the evolution of the Eastern Church.

In order to obtain general approval for such a measure, the Fathers could not afford to alienate the Pope, who had played a prominent role during the final stages of the dogmatic struggles, and

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

whose representatives were still present at Chalcedon. It would, therefore, be illogical to suppose that the Fathers intended to deny the primacy of the Bishop of Rome, a primacy which had just made itself particularly apparent in the triumph of orthodoxy at Chalcedon.

It should be pointed out also that the Chalcedonian Fathers did not protest the Roman version of canon six of Nicaea. This version vehemently emphasized the primacy of Rome in the Church, and it was read, during the last session, by the legate Paschasius.¹⁵⁵ The old Latin translation prefaced the wording of the canon as follows: *Romana ecclesia semper habuit primatum*. Although the Roman version differed from the original, also read during the last session, the Fathers did not question the authenticity of the Roman version and its preface.

Moreover, the fact that the Fathers of the Council, the Patriarch Anatolius, and the Emperor Marcian himself insisted that the Pope should sign the canon, is sufficient indication that the conciliar Fathers saw in its wording no offensive move against Rome.¹⁵⁶

The most serious offense to the Westerners lay in the Fathers' reasons for having accorded positions of primacy to Rome and Constantinople – namely that both cities were capitals of the Empire, and residences of the emperor. Here again is a clear expression of the principle of adaptation to political organization, and indication of how profoundly it was rooted in the minds of Eastern prelates.

¹⁵⁵ Mansi, *ibid.*, col. 444; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, p. 95. On this version, which originated in Rome or, at least, in Italy in the fourth century, see F. B. C. Maassen, *Geschichte der Quellen und der Literatur des canonischen Rechts im Abendlande bis zum Ausgange des Mittelalters*, I (Graz, 1870), pp. 19 seq. Cf. C. H. Turner, *Ecclesiae occid. Monum.* I, pp. 103, 121; E. Schwartz, "Der sechste nicaen. Kanon," *op. cit.*, pp. 627 seq.

¹⁵⁶ Cf. T. Harapin, *Primatus pontificis Romani in Concilio Chalcedonensi et Ecclesiae dissidentes* (Quaracchi, 1923), pp. 113 seq. P. Batiffol, *Le siège apostolique*, pp. 556 seq. Consult especially E. Herman, "Chalkedon und die Ausgestaltung des Konstantinopolitanischen Primats," in A. Grillmeir, H. Bacht, *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, 2 (Würzburg, 1953), pp. 459–490 (especially pp. 463–472). This unbiased and well-documented study is one of the best on this subject by a Roman Catholic scholar. Cf. also T. O. Martin, "The Twenty-eighth Canon of Chalcedon," *ibid.*, pp. 433–458. Cf. also J. Hergenrother, *Photius, Patriarch von Constantinopel*, I (Regensburg, 1867), p. 75. Even M. Jugie (*Le schisme byzantin*, [Paris, 1941], pp. 11–19), although very critical of the wording of the canon, failed to discover in it an outspoken negation of the primacy.

APOSTOLICITY BEFORE CHALCEDON

From their point of view, this was the strongest argument, and they were unable to see in it any affront to the Roman see, particularly as the new canon once again confirmed its position.

Moreover, the wording of the canon does not imply that the Fathers of Nicaea had conferred on the Bishop of Rome rights that he had not previously possessed. It revealed that they merely acknowledged those rights which were Rome's due, and which she already enjoyed. It is in this sense that the Greek words ἀποδεδώκασι τὰ πρεσβεῖα should be translated.¹⁵⁷

As to the nature of those rights, the meaning of canon six of the Nicene Council should be recalled and compared with the rights that canon twenty-eight of Chalcedon guaranteed to the see of Constantinople. There is no allusion in either canon to the primacy which the see of Rome claimed and regarded as of divine origin, reposing on the will of the Founder of the Church, but only a reference to the extension of the jurisdiction of both sees. Rome had won its rights not only because of its position as the see of Peter, but also because it was the capital of the Empire and the most prominent city in Italy.

Another canon voted by the Council illustrates the principle, dominant at the assembly of Chalcedon, of adaptation to political organization. Canon seventeen ruled that, in the event of the founding of new cities, Church organization should adapt itself to the new situation.¹⁵⁸ This canon, together with others, was also approved by the legates and was not disavowed by the Pope, which suggests that neither the legates nor the Pope saw anything unacceptable in it.

Leo must have known that at that time, even in the West, the principle of adaptation to the administrative division of the Empire was generally accepted without apparent opposition. He must have remembered that Valentinian III had also used the principle of adaptation as an argument for Roman primacy in his novel of 445, and that the Empress Placidia had thought highly of it.¹⁵⁹ He was,

¹⁵⁷ Cf. E. Herman, *op. cit.*, p. 468.

¹⁵⁸ Mansi, 7, col. 365; ed. E. Schwartz, "Der sechste nicaen. Kanon," *op. cit.*, p. 357: εἰ δέ τις ἐκ βασιλικῆς ἐξουσίας ἐκαινίσθη πόλις εἰ αὐτῆς καινισθῆι, τοῖς πολιτικοῖς καὶ δημοσίοις τύποις καὶ τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν παροικιῶν ἡ τάξις ἀκολουθεῖτω.

¹⁵⁹ See *supra*, pp. 73-75.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

therefore, well aware that, while opposed to the acceptance of this canon, he could not attack it directly nor question the validity of a principle still recognized in both Churches. On the other hand, because he lived at a time when this principle permeated the ecclesiastical life of the whole Empire, he knew that the canon, in itself, did not involve any denial of the primatial rights claimed by his see which he conceived to be supreme. This would explain why he did not attack the principle of adaptation on which the canon was founded, but resorted instead to the rather abstruse argument that it violated the Church order confirmed by the Council of Nicaea.

It is evident that the Nicene Fathers had not intended to determine for all time the precedence of the major episcopal sees. Their only purpose was to regulate the extension of the jurisdiction of the three principal sees. Pope Leo thus interpreted canon six of the Nicene Council in a way which might have appeared strange to contemporary observers. In order better to serve his purpose, the Pope elevated the Council of Nicaea to the highest rank, promoting its sixth canon to a definite regulation of Church affairs, brought about through the special inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and not susceptible to alteration by anyone.¹⁶⁰

Another reason for Leo's attitude lay in the fact that, if he approved the canon in question, it would be almost impossible to prevent the principle that inspired it from being applied to the Western Church in Italy, thus jeopardizing the supreme position of Rome. Leo knew what had happened when Milan became the residence of the Western emperor. Italy was divided into two dioceses, and Rome lost direct jurisdiction over Northern Italy, which obtained a metropolitan in the bishop of Milan, the residential city. Pope Damasus had also experienced the difficult situation created for the Bishop of Rome when the see of Milan was in the hands of a strong personality, such as St. Ambrose, who often had his own ideas about the conduct of Church affairs, and was not afraid to act on his own initiative in his relations with the East.

In Leo's time the residential city of the Western Emperor was

¹⁶⁰ *Leo ad Marcionem*, Mansi, 6, *Epist.* 104, col. 192; ed. E. Schwartz, t. 2, vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 60 (256).

APOSTOLICITY BEFORE CHALCEDON

Ravenna. If the principle of accommodation to the division of the Empire, so clearly expressed in canon twenty-eight, were meekly accepted and approved by Leo, what would prevent the Western Emperor's taking similar action with regard to his residence at Ravenna? In order to avert such unpleasant possibilities, it was best for Leo to revert to the Council of Nicaea, and to defend its decision, after proclaiming the sixth canon to be a measure inspired by the Holy Ghost, and therefore unchangeable.

Leo thus showed more adroitness than his predecessor, Innocent I, who in his letter to Alexander of Antioch in 413¹⁶¹ directly attacked the principle of accommodation, declaring that "it was not appropriate that the Church of God should be submitted to the changing necessities of the world or should follow the divisions and honors which the emperor might regard as expedient in the interest of his own affairs." Although Innocent I does not specifically say so, it was possible to discern in his declaration an intention to prevent any further growth of Constantinople's prestige in the Church through the application of canon three of the Council of Constantinople.

Leo might have been inspired in his choice of arguments by a letter which one of his predecessors, Boniface I, sent to the bishops of Illyricum on March 11, 422, in which he defended his jurisdiction over this province and opposed the claims of the bishop of Constantinople. Boniface's letter contains the following:¹⁶² "... if you will examine carefully the sanction of the canons, you will find which Church is the second after that of Rome and which is the third.... Let the great Eastern Churches in question, that of Alexandria and that of Antioch, keep their dignity, determined by the canons respecting the ecclesiastical right." Here, for the first time, the sixth canon of the Nicaean Council was quoted in defense of the rights of

¹⁶¹ See *supra*, p. 13.

¹⁶² PL, 20, *Epist.* 15, chap. 5, col. 782: *Quoniam locus exigit, si placet recensere canonum sanctiones, reperiatis quae sit post Ecclesiam Romanam secunda sedes, quaeve sit tertia. A quibus ideo ita rerum videtur ordo distinctus, ut se ecclesiasticorum pontifices caeterarum, sub uno tamen eodemque sacerdotio habere cognoscant quibus charitate servata propter ecclesiasticam disciplinam debeant esse subjecti. Et quidem haec sententia canonum a vetustate duravit, ut nunc usque, Christo nostro favente, perdurat.... Servant Ecclesiae magnae praedictae per canones dignitates, Alexandrina et Antiochena, habentes ecclesiastici juris notitiam....*

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

the Roman see. Boniface did not explicitly state that the Fathers of Nicaea had permanently established either the order of precedence of the great Churches, or their number.¹⁶³ His argument turns, however, against the see of Constantinople, and thus, indirectly, against the third canon of the Council of Constantinople. Leo improved considerably on Boniface's arguments.

The behavior of the Roman legates during the Council of Chalcedon, and especially at the fifteenth and sixteenth sessions, poses an important question: Did the Pope foresee an attempt by the Fathers to bolster the position of the see of Constantinople, and did he give his legates certain instructions to oppose it?

The attitude of the legates during the first session seems to indicate that there was no objection in Rome, at least in principle, to applying to Constantinople the traditional practice of adaptation to the civil organization of the Empire. When the Acts of the *Latrocinium* were read, the Fathers were amazed to discover that on this occasion Flavian of Constantinople had been assigned no more than fifth rank among the principal prelates. The legate Paschasinus spoke out with surprising frankness:¹⁶⁴ "Behold we ourselves regard Anatolius to be first, as God also regards him, and these Acts have assigned to the blessed Flavian the fifth place." Diogenes, the Bishop of Cyzicus then declared to the legates: "Yes, because you know the canons," which could only have been a reference to the canons of the Council of Constantinople (381).

¹⁶³ E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums*, I, pp. 377 seq., thinks that Boniface took this interpretation of the Nicaean decision from the third chapter of the so-called *Decretum Gelasianum* which determined the supreme position of Rome in the Church, and described Alexandria and Antioch as inferior in rank to Rome. This chapter is regarded by him as a genuine decree of the Roman Council of 382 (cf. *ibid.*, pp. 247 seq.) and an answer to the third canon of Constantinople. This does not seem to be the case. Boniface's words are too mildly expressed and differ considerably from the bold assertion of the *Decretum*. His words *sententia canonum [quae] a vetustate duravit* should be related not to the Council of 381, but to that of Nicaea of 325. Chapter three of the *Decretum* should be dated from the time of the Acacian schism at the end of the fifth or beginning of the sixth century. See *supra*, p. 56, and *infra*, pp. 109-122 on Gelasius.

¹⁶⁴ Mansi, 6, col. 608B; ed. E. Schwartz, t. 2, vol. I, pt. 1, p. 78. Ἰδε ἡμεῖς, θεοῦ θέλοντος, κύριον τὸν Ἀνατόλιον πρῶτον ἔχον. οὗτοι πέμπτον ἔταξαν τὸν μακάριον Φλαυιανόν. Διογένης ὁ εὐλαβεστάτος ἐπίσκοπος ἐκκλησίας Κυζίκου εἶπεν. ἐπειδὴ ὑμεῖς τοὺς κανόνας οἴδατε.

APOSTOLICITY BEFORE CHALCEDON

There remains the attitude of Pope Leo himself. When the legates launched a vigorous protest during the sixteenth session, which began November 1st, against the so-called twenty-eighth canon, Bishop Eusebius of Dorylaeum declared that he had read canon three of the Council of Constantinople of 381 to Pope Leo in the presence of some clerics of Constantinople, and that the Pope had approved it. This must have occurred about Easter 451, when a delegation sent by Anatolius of Constantinople delivered to the Pope a letter from Anatolius in which he regularized relations between Rome and Constantinople. The members of the delegation would thus have been witnesses of Eusebius' claim. It is certain that Eusebius, after his deposition by the *Latrocinium*, had taken refuge in Rome and was still there in 451.¹⁶⁵

During the last days of the Council, when the legates were invited to the fifteenth session, at which the question of the see of Constantinople was to be discussed, they refused to attend, declaring that they had no instructions from the Pope on this matter.¹⁶⁶ This seems to indicate that the Pope had not anticipated the course of events, and had, therefore, failed to inform his legates as to how to proceed with regard to the privileges of the see of Constantinople.

However, in contradiction to this conclusion there is some evidence that during the sixteenth session the legates behaved as if they were in possession of instructions concerning both the canons of Nicaea and the question of the precedence of the main episcopal sees, for when, during the debates provoked by their protest against canon twenty-eight, Archdeacon Aetius invited them to reveal whether or not they had been instructed by the Pope on the subject under discussion, the legate Boniface rose to say:¹⁶⁷ "The most blessed and apostolic Pope gave us, among others, this mandate," whereupon – as it is reported in the Latin Acts – he read from a short document: "Also do not suffer the constitution of the Holy Fathers to be violated by any temerity, and safeguard in everything the dignity of our person in yourselves whom we have sent in our stead. And if

¹⁶⁵ See *supra*, p. 73. Cf. E. Schwartz, "Der sechste nicaen. Kanon," *op. cit.*, p. 624. Mansi, 7, col. 449; ed. E. Schwartz, t. 2, vol. 1, pt. 3, p. 97 (456).

¹⁶⁶ Mansi, *ibid.*, col. 428; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, p. 88, *idem.*, t. 2, vol. 3, pt. 3, p. 101.

¹⁶⁷ Mansi, *ibid.*, col. 443; ed. E. Schwartz, t. 2, vol. 3, pt. 3, p. 109.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

by chance any should make so bold as to boast of the splendor of their cities so as to usurp something for themselves, reject it most energetically."

These words might at first be assumed to refer to canon twenty-eight. E. Schwartz,¹⁶⁸ who must be credited with having solved the difficulties resulting from the differences between the Greek and Latin versions of this passage, believes that the incident mentioned by Eusebius of Dorylaeum discloses the intention of Anatolius and of the imperial court to seize the first opportunity of bolstering the prestige of the see of Constantinople. This may have been the price that the Empress Pulcheria had to pay Anatolius to forsake Dioscorus, and Leo may have acceded to a non-committal agreement to canon three of 381 under the impression that no general council would be convoked. When he learned, however, that the Emperor had convoked a general council, he instructed his legates as set forth above.

Schwartz's explanation of this incident is, however, not satisfactory. It makes the attitude of the legates during the first session with regard to the position of Constantinople, and their denial during the fifteenth that they had any instructions concerning the subject, seem very strange. Why did they not protest canons nine and seventeen which granted the eastern bishops the right of appeal to the exarch of the diocese or the bishop of Constantinople against the judgment of the metropolitan? This measure, which enhanced the prestige of Constantinople at the expense of the exarchs, was not in accordance with the decisions of Nicaea. If Schwartz's explanation is accepted, the attitude of Leo, attested by the Bishop of Dorylaeum, warrants rather severe judgment, which should rightfully cause his admirers some embarrassment.¹⁶⁹

Although the text of the Pope's instructions to the legates has been lost, except for the passage given above, it is reasonable to assume that it contained nothing that could have been used against canon twenty-eight, for the legates would certainly not have failed to quote it. The wording of this one passage, however, does

¹⁶⁸ E. Schwartz, "Der sechste nicaen. Kanon," *op. cit.*, pp. 624 seq.

¹⁶⁹ Leo's attitude greatly puzzled L. N. de Tillemont, (*Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique*, 15 [Paris, 1711]), pp. 617 seq. Cf. P. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 559.

APOSTOLICITY BEFORE CHALCEDON

not necessarily signify that the Bishop of Constantinople was expressly singled out.¹⁷⁰ The impression conveyed rather is that the Pope was anxious to prevent any recurrence of the incidents at the *Latrocinium* of Ephesus. There, it was not the Bishop of Constantinople, but Dioscorus of Alexandria who, in "boasting of the splendor of his city," condemning the Bishop of Constantinople, and ignoring the Roman legates, had usurped the leading role for himself. The extent of the Pope's preoccupation with the attitude of Dioscorus can be appreciated from the fact that the Alexandrian was mentioned specifically in another part of the instructions. At the beginning of the first session the legate Paschasinus, on the strength of his instructions from the Pope, declared that if Dioscorus were admitted to the Council the legates would quit it.¹⁷¹ The tumultuous scenes which followed this declaration indicated that the Pope's preoccupation with Dioscorus and his influence was not altogether unfounded, although he may have overestimated the strength of Dioscorus' position.¹⁷²

Taking all of this into consideration, it would be better to assume that Pope Leo did not give any specific instructions to his legates concerning the precedence of Constantinople in Church organization. But an explanation must be sought for the excited and bewildered attitude of the legates when they learned of the vote at the fifteenth session, and also for the hostile attitude assumed by Leo the Great toward the so-called canon twenty-eight.

The Pope and his legates may have been reconciled, albeit grudgingly, to the idea that the see of Constantinople, because it was the residence of the emperor, should be granted precedence over the two other Eastern sees. To that extent they could pay lip service to the old principle of adaptation to the political organization of the Empire which was still, at that time, generally accepted. In

¹⁷⁰ Cf. E. Caspar, *op. cit.*, p. 519, footnote 6.

¹⁷¹ Mansi, 6, cols. 580 seq.; ed. E. Schwartz, t. 2, vol. 1, pt. 1, p. 65.

¹⁷² The discrepancies between the Greek text relating the incident that occurred during the sixteenth session, and the Latin text, which caused so much bewilderment to E. Caspar (*op. cit.*, p. 520), have been ironed out by E. Schwartz ("Der sechste nicaen. Kanon," *op. cit.*, pp. 614-627). The Latin text seems to be genuine, but the Greek text was slightly toned down after 518, and adapted somewhat to suit the policy of reconciliation, followed by Justinian I, between the Western and the Eastern Church.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

that connection canon three of 381 granted to the see of Constantinople only an honorary precedence without granting to its bishops any extension of their jurisdiction. The legates could overlook, too, canons nine and seventeen of Chalcedon, which granted to the bishops of Constantinople a status of concurrent instance in appellations,¹⁷³ because it did not substantially alter the position of the bishops of Constantinople.

Canon twenty-eight of Chalcedon, however, promoted the see of Constantinople to a position of great power in the East, giving it jurisdiction over the minor dioceses and over new missionary lands, and this was much more than a precedence merely of honor. Suddenly there arose before the bewildered eyes of the legates the spectre of an immense new ecclesiastical power in the East, which, because it had the support of the emperors, could become exceedingly dangerous for the unity of the Church and for the primacy of Rome. It may be that the Westerners had not realized what changes had taken place in the Eastern dioceses since 381, or that, at the time of

¹⁷³ It is difficult to interpret the exact meaning of the two canons—nine and seventeen—giving this privilege to the bishop of Constantinople. Canon nine (Mansi, 7, col. 361) states: εἰ δὲ πρὸς τὸν τῆς αὐτῆς ἐπαρχίας μητροπολίτην ἐπίσκοπος ἢ κληρικὸς ἀμφισβητοίῃ, καταλαμβανέτω ἢ τὸν ἐξάρχον τῆς διοικήσεως, ἢ τὸν τῆς βασιλευούσης Κωνσταντινουπόλεως θρόνον, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ δικαίεσθω. Canon seventeen repeats this measure in the following words (*ibid.*, col. 365): εἰ δὲ τις παρὰ τοῦ ἰδίου ἀδικοῖτο μητροπολίτου, παρὰ τῷ ἐπάρχῳ τῆς διοικήσεως, ἢ τῷ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως θρόνῳ δικαίεσθω, καθὰ προεῖρηται.

This wording can be adduced in favor of the interpretation by K. Müller (*Kirchengeschichte*, 1 [3rd ed., Tübingen, 1914], pp. 656–658), who thinks that the exarchs are the bishops of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem who were soon to be called patriarchs. If this interpretation is accepted, then Constantinople became the last court of appeal for the three minor dioceses, which had no proper exarchs. It is true that the bishops of the capitals of these dioceses were also sometimes called exarchs, but they never achieved the same status as those of Alexandria and Antioch. In any case, later practice seems to confirm this interpretation, as is indicated by two of Justinian's legislative measures which treat the same subject as do canons nine and seventeen. *Codex Justinianus* I, 4, 29; *Novell.* 123, chap. 22, ed. Th. E. Mommsen, P. Krüger (Berlin, 1928, 1929), 2, p. 45, 3, p. 611. A similar conclusion was reached by L. Duchesne (*Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise*, 3, p. 462), by C. Turner (*Studies in Early Church History*, pp. 43 seq.), and by P. Batiffol, *op. cit.*, p. 555. Cf. also R. Vaucourt, "Patriarches," in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* 11, col. 2262. M. Jugie (*Schism byz.*, p. 20), follows L. Bréhier (*Histoire de l'Eglise*, ed. A. Fliche, V. Martin, 5 [Paris, 1947], p. 238) and C. J. Hefele, *Konziliengeschichte*, 2 (1875), pp. 513 seq.), and thinks that the bishops of Constantinople were given a concurrent jurisdiction over Alexandria and Antioch.

APOSTOLICITY BEFORE CHALCEDON

the Council of Chalcedon, the bishops of Constantinople already enjoyed virtual direct jurisdiction over the metropolitans not only in Thrace, but also in Cappadocia and Pontus.¹⁷⁴ Strictly speaking, this amounted to a direct violation of the canons of Nicaea, and the legates, therefore, considered themselves perfectly entitled to invoke the quoted passage of the instructions given to them in writing by the Pope. This passage may not originally have been intended to be used against the pretensions of the see of Constantinople, for such a turn of events was not expected. The legates' attitude was approved by the Pope who, as previously pointed out, improved considerably on their arguments against canon twenty-eight.

What would certainly have aroused any Westerner against such a measure was the fact that the Fathers, in guaranteeing its ancient privileges to the see of Rome, had completely neglected to stress either the apostolic character of that see or the fact that the Pope was the successor to Peter, the Prince of the Apostles.

As has been shown, in Leo's time the principle of apostolicity was generally accepted in the West as the decisive factor in Church leadership, and, as far as Rome was concerned, this principle was expressed in the primacy of the successor of St. Peter in the Church. But the East was far slower than the West to appreciate this principle, and this would explain why the Fathers did not realize the importance of emphasizing Rome's apostolicity or the Pope's succession from Peter.

It may be that some of them saw what was involved, and tried to give some assurances to Leo in the letter in which the Council announced its decisions to him. They spoke, therefore, in terms of highest praise of Leo the Great's leading role throughout the con-

¹⁷⁴ L. S. de Tillemont, *op. cit.*, 15, pp. 702-706 quoted the numerous cases of direct intervention by the bishops of Constantinople in the minor Eastern dioceses. St. John Chrysostom acted as if the three dioceses were within his field of jurisdiction. Socrates (*Hist. eccles.*, 5, chap. 8; *PG*, 67, col. 580) goes so far as to say that the Council of 381 had already put the whole of Thrace under Constantinople's jurisdiction. This was not so, but it can be judged from this statement that when Socrates wrote his history in about 440, Thrace was already regarded as belonging to Constantinople's jurisdiction. See, for details, S. Vailhé, "Constantinople," *Dict. de théol. cath.*, 3, cols. 1322 seq. and K. Müller *ibid.*, pp. 627-631.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

troversy.¹⁷⁵ "Indeed you," they wrote, "as the head among the members, presided here in the person of your representatives, who led the way by their correct counsel." Later on they expressed their horror that Dioscorus "has extended his fury against him who has been entrusted by the Saviour with the guardianship of the vineyard – we mean Your Holiness – and planned your excommunication, after you have been so zealous to keep the body of the Church united. And though he ought to have repented of this, and begged mercy with tears, he rather rejoiced in it as in something noble, despising the letter of Your Holiness, and resisting all true doctrine."

These were flattering words, acknowledging quite clearly the primacy claimed by Leo. Furthermore, the Fathers showed their willingness to respect also the apostolic character of the see of Rome, the source of the Pope's claims to primacy, when they wrote concerning the approval of canon twenty-eight: "Moreover we have confirmed the canon of the one hundred and fifty Fathers, who were assembled at Constantinople in the time of Theodosius the Great, of happy memory, which defines that the see of Constantinople shall have privileges so as to rank second after your own most holy and apostolic see, in the assurance that, as with your accustomed interest you have often shone your brilliant apostolic radiance even upon the Church of Constantinople, you will increase it many times, since you share your own privileges ungrudgingly with your brethren."

The Roman see is called apostolic also in the Emperor Marcian's letter to the Pope in which he requested the Pope to accept canon twenty-eight.¹⁷⁶ Anatolius, too, in his missive to the Pope was most reverent toward the Roman See, and stressed its apostolic character in two passages. When urging the Pope to accept canon twenty-eight he wrote:¹⁷⁷ "And we have engaged ourselves on this subject, confident that it would be meet for your Holiness to accord this honor to the see of Constantinople, especially as your apostolic see is full of solicitude for it, and lives in concord with that see, and because your see has always abundantly accorded its help in things needed by that see." After recalling the protest of the papal legates and

¹⁷⁵ Mansi, 6, *Epist.* 98, cols. 148 seq.; ed. E. Schwartz, t. 2, vol. 1, pt. 3, pp. 116 (475) seq.

¹⁷⁶ Mansi, *ibid.*, col. 169; ed. E. Schwartz, t. 2, vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 55 (251).

¹⁷⁷ Mansi, *ibid.*, chap. 4, cols. 177 seq.

APOSTOLICITY BEFORE CHALCEDON

stressing that the canon in question was voted by the Fathers at the suggestion of the Emperor, Anatolius asked the Pope once more for its confirmation:¹⁷⁸ "Because the see of Constantinople regards your apostolic see as a father, uniting itself in a most excellent way with you, in order that through your solicitude for it, all may learn that [as] you have cared for it before, so you will display now the same solicitude for it."

It seems, then, that through this emphasis on the apostolicity of the Roman see, the conciliar Fathers and Anatolius hoped to give the Pope some supplementary guarantee, and to appease whatever fears he may have had. All of their efforts, however, could not satisfy the Pope, for these were flattering declarations, without official character. It would have been different perhaps if the Fathers had inserted into the wording of the canon some of the expressions they had used in their missives. A clear confirmation in the canon of the apostolicity of the Roman see, and of the prerogatives which derived from it, might have satisfied Leo, or might at least have made it very difficult for him to withhold his approval.

It is most unfortunate that the Eastern Fathers who had formulated canon twenty-eight showed a lack of comprehension of Rome's anxiety. It is, moreover, surprising, for the dogmatic victory of orthodoxy at the Council was won under the leadership of the great Pope Leo, whose name was most profoundly venerated by all. The East was still greatly influenced by the principle of adaptation to the new political situation, and could not see beyond its immediate horizon. That the Fathers failed to find a point of compromise between the two principles of Church organization is regrettable, for, as has already been shown, it was within their reach. However, their failure marked the beginning of a long struggle over apostolicity, and was the source of new bitterness in relations between East and West.

It is open to speculation whether a more satisfactory wording of the contested canon might have been arrived at if the legates had attended the meeting. In any case, their refusal to be present at the discussion seems to have been a serious tactical mistake, though they tried vainly to correct it during the final session. So it happened

¹⁷⁸ *Idem*, chap. 5, col. 180.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

that the Council, which, in doctrinal matters, should have been a great triumph of Roman leadership ended in disagreement between East and West on matters of Church organization.

The Pope apparently studied thoroughly the Acts of the Council brought back by his legates, and, considering his situation carefully, procrastinated for some time before answering the letters of the Emperor and Anatolius. He seems to have interpreted the presence of only 185 prelates at the meeting that had produced the twenty-eighth canon as a sign that the canon was not popular among Eastern prelates. He was certainly encouraged by the fact that the bishops of Illyricum had followed the example of the legates and had abstained from attending the session.¹⁷⁹ Although the signatories of the canon had protested vehemently against the accusation of the legates that they had signed under pressure,¹⁸⁰ the Pope appears to have doubted the sincerity of their protestation.

He overlooked the fact that the signatories included most of the bishops from the three minor dioceses, and that the Bishops of Antioch and Jerusalem had also approved the canon. He may have interpreted the proposal of Thalassius, the Exarch of Pontus, to open negotiations with Anatolius for settling the question of ordinations as an indication of the opposition of the hierarchy of the three dioceses to the stipulations of the canon, an opposition that might reveal itself more emphatically if the canon were rejected by the Roman see.

Leo finally made his decision, and, on May 22, 452, sent letters to the Empress Pulcheria, the Emperor, and Anatolius in which he endorsed the protests of his legates against canon twenty-eight. In his letter to the Empress Pulcheria he confirmed the words of his legate Lucentius that the decision of the Council of Constantinople remained without effect:¹⁸¹ "It is a sign of pride and immoderation [on the part of Anatolius of Constantinople] to try to go beyond the limits of his power, to want to usurp the rights of others in defiance of old usage, to contest the primacy of so many metropolitans,

¹⁷⁹ *Idem.*, chap. 7, cols. 429 seq.; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, pt. 3, pp. 89 (448) seq.

¹⁸⁰ Mansi, *ibid.*, col. 441; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, p. 94 (453).

¹⁸¹ Mansi, 6, *Epist.* 106, cols. 196 seq.; ed. E. Schwartz, t. 2, vol. 4, pp. 57 seq.

APOSTOLICITY BEFORE CHALCEDON

to introduce war and new disturbances into peaceful provinces which were once organized by the disposition of the holy Synod of Nicaea and, in order that the decrees of the venerable Fathers should be rescinded, to put forward the agreement of some bishops, an agreement which remained ineffective for so many years. The aforesaid Bishop boasts that this agreement, which he thinks favorable to his cause, was passed about sixty years ago. It is vain of him to think that something can be of use to him which, even if someone dared desire it, could not be obtained."

In his letter to the Patriarch, the Pope said:¹⁸² "It is useless to invoke in favor of your claim, the decision of some bishops which was passed, as you pretend, about sixty years ago. [This decision] was never sent by your predecessors for the confirmation of the apostolic see." Later on, he defended the right of Alexandria to second place in the Church, because the see was founded by St. Mark, disciple of St. Peter, and allotted third place to Antioch because it was founded by St. Peter, and because there, for the first time, the faithful were called Christians.¹⁸³

The principle that in Church organization the apostolic foundation of the see should be the deciding factor is very clearly defined in these words, but a slight inconsistency in the statement should be pointed out. If the principle of apostolic foundation had been applied correctly, the second place after Rome should have been given to Antioch. This see was a foundation of St. Peter and St. Paul, and it was here that Christianity received its name. However, in this special instance, Alexandria, though founded only by an evangelist, won precedence because of its importance in the political and cultural life of the Empire. This precedence was sanctioned by the synod of Nicaea, and Leo the Great had to accept it, although, in the eyes of the Easterners, it could weaken, his argument favoring the principle of apostolic foundation in Church organization.

¹⁸² Mansi, *ibid.*, col. 204; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, p. 61.

¹⁸³ Mansi, *ibid.*, col. 206; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, p. 61: *Nihil Alexandrinae sedi ejus quam per sanctum Marcum Evangelistam beati Petri discipulum meruit, pereat dignitatis nec Dioscoro impietatis suae pertinacia corrumpente splendor tantae Ecclesiae tenebris obscuretur alienis. Antiochena quoque Ecclesia, in qua primum praedicante beato apostolo Petro christianum nomen exortum est, in paternae constitutionis ordine perseveret et in gradu tertio collocata numquam se fiat inferior.*

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

The Pope expressed his opinion more directly in his letter to the Emperor Marcian:¹⁸⁴ "Let Constantinople have its own glory. It is our wish to let her enjoy, under the protection of the right hand of God, for long years the benefits of your reign. But there is one way for earthly things and another for divine things, and no construction will be stable unless it shall be erected on the rock which the Lord made as a foundation [Matt. 16:18]. The man who covets that which is not due to him will lose even that which is his. The aforesaid [Anatolius] should be satisfied to have obtained, with the help of your clemency and thanks to my willing consent, the episcopacy of such a city. Let him not disdain as unworthy the Imperial City which he cannot make into an apostolic see."

In this way the principle of apostolic foundation was reintroduced into Church organization and became a strong argument, enabling Rome to defend its rights and tending to place Constantinople at a disadvantage.

But there was even more to the Pope's argument. In connecting the sees of Alexandria and Antioch so intimately with St. Peter and Rome, Leo added a new argument to the arsenal with which Rome was defending its primacy – the Petrine tradition. It has been shown how this tradition was known to Innocent I and Boniface,¹⁸⁵ but Leo I was the first to use it directly against Constantinople.

It is agreed that Leo the Great had developed, especially through his sermons, the idea of the Pope as the vicar of Peter, who was himself the vicar of Christ.¹⁸⁶ In his opposition to canon twenty-eight, Leo tried to combine this idea with the principle that only the sees intimately connected with Peter's activity could rightfully follow immediately the see of Rome, which had been consecrated by Peter's preaching and martyrdom. In his letter to Maximus of Antioch who had been consecrated, against the canonical prescriptions, by Anatolius of Constantinople, the Pope stressed this principle more forcefully than in his letter to Anatolius.

¹⁸⁴ Mansi, *ibid.*, col. 192; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, p. 56.

¹⁸⁵ See *supra* pp. 14, 15, 87, 88.

¹⁸⁶ This has been thoroughly discussed by E. Caspar (*op. cit.*, 1, pp. 426–431). Sermon 4 (*PL*, 54, cols. 148 seq.) is the most important in this respect. Cf. also E. Caspar's study "Primatus Petri," in *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung*, 47, *Kanon. Abt.* 16 (1927), pp. 329–331.

APOSTOLICITY BEFORE CHALCEDON

He wrote to Maximus:¹⁸⁷ "And therefore, most cherished brother, in your devotion you should be aware, with all your heart, of that Church government which the Lord wanted you to direct, and you should bear in mind the doctrine which the first of all the apostles, the most blessed Peter, preached, uniformly to all the world, but which he had planted by a special authority in the cities of Antioch and Rome. . . . You should, therefore, watch with utmost vigilance that heretical depravity may not dare to vindicate anything, as it behooves you to resist such things with sacerdotal authority and to inform us more often, through your accounts, on the progress of the Churches. So it is meet that you should be a consort of the apostolic see in this solicitude, and you may be confident that we acknowledge the privileges of the third see, which cannot be diminished in anything by anyone's ambition. Because I have such a great reverence for the canons of Nicaea, I would neither allow nor suffer that the constitutions of the holy Fathers be violated by any innovation. . . . Therefore, if your love causes you to think that something should be done for [the preservation of] the privileges of the Antiochene Church, try to explain it in suitable letters that we may decisively and appropriately answer your consultations."

When, at last, Proterius the new Bishop of Alexandria, who replaced Dioscorus, gave satisfactory evidence of his orthodoxy, Leo sent him, in March 454, a letter echoing the same idea of the three Petrine sees.¹⁸⁸ "It was proper," he says, "that such writing should be sent from the Bishop of Alexandria to the apostolic see, showing that the Egyptians had learned, from the beginning, through the teaching of the most blessed Peter the Apostle and through blessed Mark, his disciple, the same truths which, as is known, the Romans believed. . . . Thus, in all things—in the rule of Faith and in the observance of discipline—the old idea must be preserved. May thy love show the firmness of a wise rector in order that the Church of Alexandria may profit from what I have defended on my own against the improper ambition of certain persons; that

¹⁸⁷ Mansi, *ibid.*, *Epist.* 119, chaps. 2, 3, cols. 239 seq.; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, p. 73.

¹⁸⁸ Mansi, *ibid.*, *Epist.* 129, chaps. 1, 3, cols. 271 seq.; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, pp. 84 seq.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

is, that the right of ancient privileges should be preserved and that all metropolitans should keep their dignity undiminished."

The Pope's stubborn refusal to approve canon twenty-eight is reflected, less openly, in his letters of June 21, 453, to the Emperor, to Pulcheria, and to the Fathers of Chalcedon,¹⁸⁹ but apparently earned some support from them. Anatolius, who, the Pope complained bitterly in a letter to Julian of Kios,¹⁹⁰ his representative in the East, was attempting to persuade the bishops of Illyricum to sign the controversial canon, was at last invited by the Emperor to make peace with Leo, and to abandon his policy of compromising with several heretical elements. He did so in a letter to the Pope in April 454, which is preserved only in a Latin translation. Therein he calmed the Pope's apprehensions concerning his religious policy and, after giving the Pope assurances as to his beliefs, defended himself against the papal accusations of attempting to elevate his see because of ambitious pride. He said it was the clergy of Constantinople and of the minor dioceses who had taken this step, and, in any case, he declared, the confirmation of the canon could be given only by the Pope.¹⁹¹

Anatolius' letter promised nothing, but it was so worded that the Pope could read into it the inference that Anatolius was abandoning his fight for the acceptance of the contested canon. The Pope placed a similar interpretation on the Emperor's letter of February 15, 453, requesting an authoritative confirmation of dogmatic decisions made at Chalcedon, of which Anatolius was in

¹⁸⁹ Mansi, *ibid.*, *Epist.* 114-117, cols. 225-236; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, pp. 67-71. Cf. also Mansi, *ibid.*, *Epist.* 128, cols. 269 seq. (March 9, 454); ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, p. 86.

¹⁹⁰ Mansi, *ibid.*, *Epist.* 117, chap. 5, col. 236; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, p. 70.

¹⁹¹ Mansi, *ibid.*, *Epist.*, 132, cols. 278 seq.; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, pp. 168 seq: *De his autem quae Constantinopolitanae gratia sedis sancita sunt in Chalchidonesi nuper universali synodo, pro certo beatitudo vestra hoc habeat nullam esse culpam in me, homine qui semper otium et quietem in humilitate me continens ab ineunte mea aetate dilexerim, sed Constantinopolitanae ecclesiae reverendissimus clerus est qui hoc habuit studium, et istarum partium religiosissimi sacerdotes, qui in hoc fuere concordēs et sibi pariter adiutores, cum et sic gestorum vis omnis et confirmatio auctoritati vestrae beatitudinis fuerit reservata. Hoc igitur bene compertum sanctitas vestra cognoscat nihil ex me istius causa factum esse negotii, qui semper omnem iactantiae levitatem et aliena adpetendi cupiditatem mihi vitandam crediderim.*

APOSTOLICITY BEFORE CHALCEDON

urgent need, for the partisans of Dioscorus were interpreting the Pope's attitude toward canon twenty-eight as hostile to all Chalcedonian decisions. To obtain the confirmation the Emperor added, at the end of his letter, the following:¹⁹² "Of course in this Your Holiness has acted with the great wisdom befitting the Bishop of the apostolic see, that is, in guarding the ecclesiastical canons you have not suffered any innovations in the old rules and customs, which have been observed to this day inviolate."

The Pope could have interpreted these words also as implying that the Emperor had in mind the canons of Nicaea, although Marcian cleverly omitted mentioning them. Marcian could as well have had in mind canon three of 381 which was confirmed at Chalcedon as a "norm of old," already in general practice in the Eastern Church.

However, the outbreak of new troubles in Palestine and the continued heretical opposition against Chalcedonian decisions,¹⁹³ concerning all of which Julian of Kios kept Leo informed, forced the Pope to display a less uncompromising attitude. Although he did not completely abandon his former opposition to the acceptance of canon twenty-eight, his answer to the Emperor's letter¹⁹⁴ reflected his new attitude of mind, and provoked in Anatolius the reaction noted above.

Leo's missive to Anatolius,¹⁹⁵ in answer to his conciliatory letter was intended to end the controversy over the contested canon. The Pope interpreted Anatolius' words as a capitulation, but was anxious to couch his answer in terms that would not offend the Bishop of the Imperial City. He took care to avoid all mention of canon twenty-eight, and contented himself with only a slight allusion to its contents. The Pope also confessed that he had felt the absence of the Bishop of Constantinople as a consort in his solicitude for the Church, and explained that he was obliged to admonish Anatolius because, as the latter had himself confessed, "things were attempted,

¹⁹² Mansi, *ibid.*, *Epist.* 110, col. 216; ed. E. Schwartz, t. 2, vol. 1, pt. 2, p. 61 (257). This letter reached Rome in June 453 after the despatch of Leo's letters 114-117, mentioned above.

¹⁹³ Cf. E. Caspar, *Geschichte*, 1, pp. 532 seq.

¹⁹⁴ Mansi, *ibid.*, *Epist.* 128, col. 269; ed. E. Schwartz, t. 2, vol. 4, p. 86.

¹⁹⁵ Mansi, *ibid.*, *Epist.* 135, cols. 290 seq.; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, pp. 88 seq.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

in transgression of canons which highly scandalized the Churches." Then, at the end of the letter, taking Anatolius at his word, the Pope, assuming that his correspondent had repented, said: "This transgression which . . . you have committed on the exhortation of others, your love would have suppressed more effectively and sincerely, if you had not performed, on the bad advice of the clerics, something which could not have been attempted without your willingness. . . . But, most beloved brother, I welcome the fact that your love professes to dislike now that which you should have disliked at that time. . . . Let the desire to have a privilege which had not been granted and which had created a dissension be completely rejected. Let the boundaries suffice which the most provident decrees of the Holy Fathers have set. . . ."

The controversy thus ended with a compromise intended to save face on both sides. The Pope saw clearly that, under the prevailing circumstances, he could not obtain more from the Emperor and the Bishop of the residential city. He pretended to have won the case, and his opponents contented themselves with the right of the *beati possidentes*, continuing to apply in practice the stipulations of canon twenty-eight, without insisting on its official promulgation and approbation. So it happened that the contested canon was not listed in the first collections of canon law in the Byzantine Church. It appeared only at the end of the sixth century, in the *Syntagma* of Fourteen Titles.¹⁹⁶

Finally, when this compromise, whose true significance was not fully realized by either party, is considered, it becomes questionable whether it might not have been better for the Pope to accept the advice of his representative, Julian of Kios, and to approve the decision of Chalcedon regarding the see of Constantinople.¹⁹⁷ It

¹⁹⁶ V. N. Benešević, *Kanoničeskij sbornik XIV titulov so vtoroj četverti VII veka do 887g.* (St. Petersburg, 1903), p. 155. It was also approved by the Council in Trullo (692), Mansi, 11, col. 960 (canon thirty-six).

¹⁹⁷ It results from the Pope's letter to Julian. Mansi, *ibid.*, *Epist.* 107, col. 207; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, p. 62. On Julian, see the monograph by A. Wille, *Bischof Julian von Kios des Nunzius Leos des Grossen in Konstantinopel*, Dissertation (Würzburg, 1909). The author seems to have solved the problem of the episcopal see of Julian. It was not the island of Kos in the Aegean Sea, but the city of Kios in Bithynia. Cf. also E. Caspar, *op. cit.*, p. 614. On Julian's intervention in favor of canon twenty-eight, see Wille, *ibid.*, pp. 87-92.

APOSTOLICITY BEFORE CHALCEDON

could have been done in a document that stressed the apostolic character of the Roman see and its primacy because of its having been founded by the Prince of the Apostles and the will of the Lord.

Leo's fears are easily comprehensible. Rome had lost its great prerogative as the center of the Empire and the residential city, and retained only its apostolic character and its successorship to St. Peter as justifications for its claims to primacy in the Church. Leo the Great correctly foresaw that the new status of the see of Constantinople would endanger the rightful claims of Rome. The victory that the see of Constantinople, with the help of Rome, had won over Alexandria was too crushing. The time might come when Rome would need the help of the oriental patriarchs against the dangerous rivalry of Constantinople. Leo saw this, and hoped that his defense of the prominence of Alexandria and Antioch in Church organization would assure him the eventual support of the two oriental sees should the necessity for curbing the pretensions of Constantinople arise.

Unfortunately the prestige of the residential city was too great throughout the East, where the principle of adaptation to civil administration was still recognized. It was, moreover, difficult to arrest this evolution in Church organization which was developing beyond the sixth canon of Nicaea. This was conspicuously apparent at the Council of Chalcedon where a new status was granted not only to Constantinople, but also to Jerusalem, a development which the Pope preferred to overlook. Maximus, Bishop of Antioch, whose rights the Pope rose to defend, concluded an agreement with Juvenal of Jerusalem which was contrary to the spirit, if not the letter, of the Nicene canons; he ceded to Juvenal the three Palestinian provinces. This arrangement, made during the eighth session,¹⁹⁸ was reached avowedly by mutual consent, and was said to have rendered all previous decisions in this matter null and void. The papal legates sanctioned the agreement in the name of the Pope, thereby considerably weakening the Pope's defense of the Nicene canons. In this way the see of Jerusalem was promoted to supra-

¹⁹⁸ Mansi, 7, cols. 180 seq. (*Sessio VII*); ed. E. Schwartz t. 2, vol. 1, pt. 3, pp. 5-7 (364-366). Cf. E. Honigmann, "Juvenal of Jerusalem," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 5 (Cambridge, Mass., 1950), pp. 245 seq. This is the most recent and best study on Juvenal (*ibid.*, pp. 209-278).

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

metropolitan status, and its bishop became an exarch, a title soon replaced by that of patriarch.¹⁹⁹ The Council of Chalcedon thus established, *de facto*, a division of the Church into five patriarchates, which was certainly a deviation from the Church division claimed by Leo to have been definitely established at Nicaea. It was a development, however, against which it was useless to struggle.

Another incident illustrated the tendency toward evolution in the East. In the Spring of 457, after the death of Marcian and the elevation of Leo I to the imperial throne, the opponents of the Chalcedonian Creed succeeded in electing their own Bishop—Timothy Aelurus—and in forcing the military commander of Alexandria to permit him to function side by side with the orthodox Bishop, Proterius. Soon afterward, a fanatical mob invaded the Church in which Proterius was celebrating the liturgy, set upon him, killed him, and burned his mutilated corpse. Egypt was thus again in the hands of the heretics.²⁰⁰

It might have been expected that the orthodox Egyptian Bishops would have appealed to the Pope, who had manifested such zeal in the defense of Alexandria's rights in Church organization. However, this did not happen. There is no evidence of an appeal to Rome, but fourteen Egyptian bishops appeared in Constantinople, and, together with some priests from the capital, presented their protests to the Emperor and to Anatolius.²⁰¹ The Pope heard of what had happened in Alexandria only from Anatolius himself. Meanwhile, Timothy also sent his own delegation to Constantinople in order to defend his case there.

There was a possibility that the Egyptians in defense of the rights of their supra-metropolitan, might attack canon twenty-eight if a new council were convoked. The opponents of Chalcedon clamored for it, but both the Pope and Anatolius saw the danger of such an attack. The Pope feared a reversal in doctrinal definition, and Anatolius, realizing that Timothy Aelurus, would defend the

¹⁹⁹ See E. Honigmann, *ibid.*, pp. 271–275, where the most complete bibliography on the introduction of the patriarchal titles will be found.

²⁰⁰ E. Caspar, *op. cit.*, I, p. 548. For more details see Th. Schnitzler, "Im Kampfe um Chalkedon," *Analecta Gregoriana*, 16, sec. B, no. 7 (Rome, 1938), pp. 5–16.

²⁰¹ Mansi, *ibid.*, cols. 524, 531.

APOSTOLICITY BEFORE CHALCEDON

rights of Alexandria against the encroachment of Constantinople, sided with the Pope. Thus a peculiar situation was created. The Pope could not cooperate with the heretics, who were ready to help him in abolishing the stipulations of canon twenty-eight, but had to welcome an alliance with Anatolius against the convocation of a new council. In view of all this, it is particularly unfortunate that no appropriate compromise was found by the Chalcedonian Fathers, Anatolius, and the Pope concerning the relative positions of Constantinople and Rome in Church organization.

CHAPTER THREE

GROWTH OF THE IDEA OF APOSTOLICITY DURING THE ACACIAN SCHISM

Acacius and Pope Simplicius — Gelasius' claims derived from Petrine tradition — Eastern and western reaction to Gelasius' claims — Increasing concern with apostolicity in the East — *Libellus Hormisdæ* — Apostolic character of the Roman see in imperial and patriarchal letters — Currency of the idea of apostolicity in the East and its possible consequences for Constantinople.

It is not impossible that the restraint practiced by Leo I and Anatolius during their common campaign against the convocation of a new council might have led to a compromise acceptable to both sides had the alliance between Rome and Constantinople endured. Unfortunately, the period of peaceful collaboration between the two sees was to be of short duration, for soon after Leo's death events proved that the apprehensions of this great Pope over the rise of the see of Constantinople were well-founded.

Acacius of Constantinople (471-489), who eventually became responsible for the break between Rome and the East, nevertheless got off to a good start. When, in 475, Basiliscus revolted against Zeno (474-491), the lawful successor of the Emperor Leo, and undertook to protect monophysitism, Acacius refused to receive Basiliscus' protégé Timothy Aelurus into the church of Hagia Sophia. Furthermore, with his faithful orthodox following, Acacius contributed considerably to the downfall of the usurper (477), and received the congratulations of Pope Simplicius (468-483) on the part he had played in the victory of orthodoxy in the East.¹

¹ Simplicius, *Epistolae*, *PL*, 58, *Epist.* 6, cols. 4 seq; Mansi, 7, col. 995; *Collectio Avellana*, *CSEL*, 35, ed. O. Günther, *Epist.* 57, pp. 129 seq.; *Epistolae Romanorum pontificum genuinae*, ed. A. Thiel, *Epist.* 5, p. 186.

APOSTOLICITY DURING THE ACACIAN SCHISM

Like Anatolius, his predecessor, Acacius, too, had his reasons for siding with the Pope.² Timothy, popularly known as "the Cat," was determined to defend the leading position held in the East by Alexandria against the new pretensions of Constantinople formulated in canon twenty-eight.

During the short monophysite reaction, Timothy, on his return to Alexandria, stopped at Ephesus and reinstated Bishop Paul in the episcopal see. Paul had been previously elected by the Ephesians in defiance of the authority of the Patriarch of Constantinople, and had therefore been deposed by Acacius. Thus was Timothy avenged for Acacius' refusal to open the church of Hagia Sophia to him when he passed through the capital. At the same time Timothy convoked a synod at Ephesus which restored the patriarchal dignity to the see of that city, deposed Acacius, and requested the usurper to confirm the synodal decision.³

Of course this reversal was of short duration. Reinstated on the throne, Zeno restored the *status quo ante*, and deposed Paul of Ephesus and other supporters of Timothy, who died in 477. The incident was a reminder to the Bishop of Constantinople that his pretensions were still open to challenge even in the East, and it may have been another reason why Acacius tried to stay on good terms with Rome at the beginning of his tenure of office.

In a letter to Simplicius in which Acacius reported the death of Timothy Aelurus and the election of the orthodox Timothy Salofaciol as Bishop of Alexandria, Acacius even expressed some respect for the Roman primacy:⁴ "As you, according to the Apostle [II

² In his letter of January 10, 476, Simplicius requested Acacius to resist all attempts of the heretics to convoke a council. *PL, ibid., Epist.* 5, col. 41; *Col. Avel., Epist.* 58, p. 130, 3; ed. A Thiel, *Epist.* 2, p. 179, chap. 3.

³ *The Syriac Chronicle of Zachariah of Mitylene*, transl. by F. J. Hamilton and E. W. Brooks, bk. 5 (London, 1899), chap. 4, pp. 109-112; Evagrius, *The Ecclesiastical History*, bk. 3, chap. 6; ed. J. Bidez, L. Parmentier (London, 1898), p. 106; *PG*, 86, cols. 2608 seq. Cf. B. J. Kidd, *A. History of the Church to A.D. 461*, 3 (Oxford, 1922), p. 407, and E. Honigmann, "Juvenal of Jerusalem," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 5 (1950), p. 273.

⁴ *PL, ibid.*, cols. 46 seq.; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 8, pp. 192 seq. It is, however, interesting to note that, although the Pope in his letters to Emperor Zeno and to Acacius called the see of Alexandria the see of the Evangelist Mark (*PL, ibid., Epist.* 4, col. 40C, *Epist.* 5, col. 41D, *Epist.* 10; col. 48C; *Col. Avel., Epist.* 56, p. 128, 11, *Epist.* 58, p. 131, 4, *Epist.* 62, p. 140, 2; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 2, p. 178, chap. 2, *Epist.* 3, p. 182, chap. 7, *Epist.* 10, p. 196), Acacius did not do so in his request.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

Cor. 11:8], have care of all Churches, you exhort us ceaselessly, although we are watching and foreseeing by our own initiative, and in referring to us, in your desire to find the true status of the Church of Alexandria, you are manifesting your usual zeal for God's interests." Of course, in the next part of the letter Acacius associated himself with the Pope in the final triumph of the good cause. It should be recalled how Leo the Great used to address the bishops as consorts of his solicitude for the whole Church. Acacius, through his phraseology, might have conveyed the idea, which Leo would have repudiated, that he considered the degree of his own solicitude coequal with that of the Pope, but he couched his letter in terms that permitted Simplicius to interpret them in the sense usually associated with Rome. This Simplicius did, thanking Acacius for his information and zeal.^{4a}

Events soon took a dangerous turn however. When, in 479, the opponents of the Chalcedonian Creed killed Stephen, the orthodox Bishop of Antioch, the Emperor Zeno intervened and caused the election of the new Bishop Calendio to take place in Constantinople, where he was consecrated by Acacius himself. The Pope deplored this transgression of the Nicene canons, and admonished the Emperor and Acacius never to repeat it.⁵ Official contact between Rome and Antioch was reopened only three years afterward when, in 482, Simplicius received from the hands of an envoy a letter from the new Antiochene Patriarch⁶ announcing his enthronement. The Pope was alarmed further by the promotion of Peter Mongus, a repentant monophysite, to the See of Alexandria.⁷

Acacius had by this time ceased to inform the Pope of developments in the East, and it was, therefore, with some surprise that the Pope learned in 482 that the Emperor, in order to influence the monophysites, still numerous in the East and therefore dangerous to the peace of the Empire, had proclaimed the so-called *Henoticon*,

^{4a} *PL, ibid., Epist.* 9, col. 47; *Col. Avel., Epist.*, 61, pp. 138 seq.; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 9, p. 195.

⁵ *PL, ibid., Epist.* 13, 14, cols. 51, seq.; *Col. Avel., Epist.* 66, 67, pp. 147-150; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 15, 16, pp. 202-206.

⁶ *PL, ibid., Epist.* 16, col. 55; *Col. Avel., Epist.* 69, p. 154; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 17, pp. 206 seq.

⁷ *PL, ibid., Epist.* 17, 18, cols. 55-59; *Col. Avel., Epist.* 68, pp. 151 seq., ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 18, pp. 208 seq.

APOSTOLICITY DURING THE ACACIAN SCHISM

a profession of faith aimed at establishing a normal status in the Eastern Churches by making some concessions to the monophysites. Acacius and Peter Mongus accepted the new Creed and, when Calendio was replaced by Peter the Fuller, it was also officially accepted in Antioch. This initiated the so-called Acacian schism (484-519).⁸

It was during this schism that Rome employed the idea of apostolicity as one of her main weapons against the patriarchs of Constantinople, although of course even before the outbreak of the schism the idea of apostolicity was appreciated in Rome. Simplicius, for example, used to stress in his letters the apostolic character of the Church of Alexandria, calling it *beati Marci evangelistae sedes*,⁹ and he was also fully conscious of the fact that he was the successor to St. Peter.¹⁰ The gentle Simplicius was, however, not a Leo, and his letters reflect his rather conciliatory character. He contented himself with refusing Acacius' approaches concerning the recognition of canon twenty-eight of Chalcedon,¹¹ but never adopted the resolute tone of Leo's letters. Actually, full use of this weapon was made only by the foremost protagonist of Roman primacy in this period, Pope Gelasius (492-496), who had administered the Roman Chancery during the time of his predecessor in office, Felix III (483-492), and

⁸ A detailed history of the Acacian schism is given by E. Schwartz in "Publizistische Sammlungen zum Acacianischen Schisma" (*Abhandl. der Bayr. Akad. der Wiss., Phil.-hist. Abteilung*, N. F., Heft 10 [1934]), pp. 161-262. On pp. 161-170 the author gives a complete schedule with bibliographical references of all official documents issued during the schism. Almost all texts of the Verona and Berlin Collections, edited by him, are published in Migne's *Patrology*, in Thiel's edition, and in the *Collectio Avellana*. Only the latter editions have been quoted.

⁹ *PL, ibid.*, *Epist.* 4, 5, 10, cols. 40, 41, 48, *Col. Avel.*, *Epist.* 56, 58, 62, pp. 128, 131, 140; ed. *Thiel, Epist.* 2, 3, 10, pp. 178, chap. 2, 182, chap. 7, 196. See *supra*, p. 107 footnote 4.

¹⁰ *PL, ibid.*, *Epist.* 4, 7, 14, cols. 40, 45, 52; *Col. Avel.*, *Epist.* 56, 60, 66, pp. 129, 12, 137, 4, 148, 4; ed. *Thiel, Epist.* 3, 6, 15, pp. 182, chap. 7, 188, chap. 2, 204, chap. 3.

¹¹ Gelasius' letter to the bishops of Dardania relates that, at Acacius' request, Emperor Leo I had approached Simplicius urging him to sanction the contested canon twenty-eight of Chalcedon. The Pope sent Bishop Probus of Canusa to Constantinople with instructions to convey to them his refusal. (*PL*, 59, col. 72D; *Col. Avel.*, *Epist.* 95, p. 389, 57; ed. *Thiel*, p. 407, chap. 10): *Eaque nihilominus etiam sub sanctae memoriae papa Simplicio legatum sedis apostolicae sanctae memoriae Probum Canusinae urbis episcopum Leone principe tunc petente praesente docuisse nullatenus posse temptari neque his prorsus praebuisset consensum*. Cf. the translation of the passage *infra*, p. 113.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

had influenced the tone of Felix's correspondence with the East. From the beginning Gelasius followed Leo's uncompromising attitude, showing, even greater firmness than had Leo.

Gelasius' ideas are evident in Felix's correspondence,¹² and his influence certainly stiffened Felix's attitude toward Acacius' successors Flavita (Phrabitus; end of 488 to March 489) and Euphemius (489-496). These two had tried to enter into communion with Rome while refusing to condemn the memory of Acacius or to break with Peter the Fuller of Alexandria. In one letter to Emperor Zeno the Pope twice¹³ quotes the classical passage (Matt. 16:18), to stress the supreme position of the Roman see in the Church, and in all four letters to the Emperor the apostolic character of the Roman see is duly stressed.¹⁴ Also, in the letters to Peter the Fuller, Acacius, Flavita, and Thalassius, the Roman see is most intimately connected with St. Peter.¹⁵ All of this gives the reader the

¹² For details see H. Koch, "Gelasius im kirchenpolitischen Dienste seiner Vorgänger, der Päpste Simplicius und Felix III," in *Sitzungsber. d. Bayr. Akad. der Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl.*, Heft 6 (Munich, 1935).

¹³ PL, 58, *Epist.* 5, col. 917D: *Per nostram parvitatem dignare suscipere venerabilem ac divinam beatissimi Petri confessionem, apostolorum scilicet principis cui et regni claves a Salvatore traditae sunt.* Cf. col. 918D. Also, *ibid.*, *Epist.* 12, col. 969C; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 15, p. 270, chap. 1, *Epist.* 1, p. 223, chap. 2.

¹⁴ PL, *ibid.*, *Epist.* 2, cols. 899C: *beati apostoli sedes*, D: *Apostoli Petri veneranda confessio materna instat vocibus, et suorum praecipue filiorum compellere non desinens confidentiam tuae pietatis, exclamat: Christiane princeps, cur me a curriculo caritatis, quo Ecclesia universalis astringitur, permittis incidi?* (ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 1, pp. 223-224, chap. 2), *Epist.* 5, cols. 918D, 920D, 922A, *Epist.* 9, cols. 934C, D: *beati Petri directa legatio*, col. 935A: *In vestro relinquo deliberationis arbitrio utrum beati apostoli Petri an Alexandrini Petri, cuiquam sit eligenda communio* (ed. Thiel, *Epist.*, 8, p. 248, 2). PL, *ibid.*, *Epist.* 12, cols. 969B: *dum ad beati Petri apostoli sedem suae refert dignitatis exordium*, 969C, quotation Matt. 16: 18, 19, 969D: *apostolicae sedis communio*, 970B, C: *beati Petri qualiscunque vicarius, non auctoritate velut apostolicae potestatis extorqueo, sed tamquam sollicitus pater...*, 971C: *cuicunque personae paterna fides, et beati Petri communio debet praeferrri* (ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 15, pp. 270, chap. 1, 271, chap. 2, 272, chap. 3, 273, chap. 5).

¹⁵ *Epist.* 4, ad Fullonem, PL, *ibid.*, cols. 913B: *vertex... omnium apostol.*, 915A: *nostri gloriosi praecessoris Petri, qui claves regni a Salvatore nostro recepit.* *Epist.* 6, ad Acacium, PL, *ibid.*, cols. 923B: *in laesionem beati Petri apostoli a cuius sede profecti fuerant...*, D: *apostolica auctoritate* (ed. Thiel, *Epist.*, 6, pp. 245, 246). *Epist.* 13, ad Flavitam, PL, *ibid.*, cols. 972A: *ad apostolicam sedem regulariter destinatur, per quam largiente Christo omnium solidatur dignitas sacerdotum*, B: *apostolorum summus, petra fidei*, C: *beati Petri communionem fidei corde suscipere*, D: *beati Petri consortio Alexandrini Petri societas praefertur*, 973B: *absolvi autem Petrus nulla ratione*

APOSTOLICITY DURING THE ACACIAN SCHISM

impression that the intention of the Pope and his secretary was to emphasize that only one see was really apostolic—the see of St. Peter—and that the teaching defended by this see was the true faith of St. Peter; to be accepted, therefore, by every Christian. In view of this, it is interesting to note that Felix III continued to follow the tradition established by Leo and Simplicius, and called the see of Alexandria, the see of St. Mark, who was Peter's disciple.¹⁶

In his own letters Gelasius emphasized the Petrine tradition even more strongly. Not only is the classical argument for the primacy (Matt. 16:18)¹⁷ frequently used, but the identification of the Roman with the apostolic see recurs so often in Gelasius' writing that it seems pointless to quote the details. In all his correspondence with the East Gelasius seldom referred to his see without calling it apostolic. He carefully avoided, too, calling any other see apostolic, but contented himself with designating Alexandria as the second see and Antioch as the third.¹⁸

Gelasius also repudiated, and again in strong terms, the twenty-eighth canon of Chalcedon,¹⁹ and in his letter to the bishops of

potuit sine apostolicae sedis assensu... beati Petri fides (ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 14, pp. 267, chaps. 1, 2, 286, chap. 3). *PL, ibid., Epist.* 14, *ad Thalassium*, cols. 975A: *beati Petri fides, beati Petri exemplum*, B: *beati Petri veritas* (ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 16, p. 274). *Libellus, PL, ibid., col.* 978C: *apud beatissimum Petrum apostolum diluere obedienter procuret... apostolicum non debet iudicium... abjicere* (ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 4, p. 241, chap. 2).

¹⁶ *PL, ibid., Epist.* 2, *ad Zenonem*, col. 899C: *ne sedes beati evangelistae Marci a doctrina magistri sui vel communionem permitteres separari* (ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 1, p. 223, chap. 2). *PL, ibid., Epist.* 2, *ad Zenonem*, col. 904B: *sedem beati Marci evangelistae ad communionem beatissimi Petri, de vitae eorum meritis devotione reducite*. (ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 1, p. 232, chap. 13). *PL, ibid., Epist.* 6, *ad Acacium*, col. 922C: *beati Marci sedes* (ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 6, p. 244).

¹⁷ *Gelasii Papae I Epistolae at decreta, PL*, 59, *Epist.* 1, *ad Euphemium*, cols. 14B, 19B; *Epist.* 4, *ad Faustum Mag.*, cols. 27C, 30B; *Epist.* 14, *sive Tractatus*, col. 89B. Cf. also *Epist.* 8 *ad Anastasium imper.* col. 43D: *quia mundo radix est apostoli gloriosa confessio*. (ed. A. Thiel, *Epist.* 3, p. 313, *Epist.* 10, p. 342, *Tract.* 2, p. 529, *Epist.* 12, pp. 352, 353, chaps. 3, 6). Cf. also his letter to the bishops of Dardania (*Epist.* 13) quoted *infra* p. 113, and *Epist.* 11, *ad episc. Dardaniae* (col. 59C; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 18, p. 385).

¹⁸ See *infra*, pp. 112, 116.

¹⁹ *Gelasii tomus de anathematis vinculo, PL, ibid., cols.* 102, 103; ed. Thiel, p. 558: *alia autem, quae per incompetentem praesumptionem illic (at the Council of Chalcedon) prolata sunt vel potius ventilata, quae sedes apostolica gerenda nullatenus delegavit, quae mox a vicariis sedis apostolicae contradicta manifestum est, quae sedes apostolica, etiam petente Marciano principe, nullatenus approbavit, quae praesul Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae tunc*

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

Dardania (495) flatly rejected the thesis that Constantinople had the right to special privileges because it was the Imperial City. This is the most outspoken passage in the letter:²⁰ "It is ridiculous that they wish to give a prerogative to Acacius on the ground that he is Bishop of the Imperial City. Is it not true that the Emperor resided at various times in Ravenna, Milan, Sirmium, and Trèves? And have the priests of those cities usurped for themselves anything besides the honors which were devolved to them in ancient times? If there is any question of the dignity due to cities, the dignity of the second and third sees [Alexandria and Antioch] is greater than that of the city [Constantinople] which not only is not numbered among [major] sees, but is not even enumerated among cities with metropolitan rights. But when you say 'Imperial City,' [remember that] there is a difference between the power of secular kingship and the distribution of ecclesiastical dignities. . . ."

These are forceful words, and it is surprising that Gelasius did not recognize the metropolitan dignity of Constantinople. As a matter of fact, in two other passages in the same letter he declared that Constantinople's metropolitan was the bishop of Heraclea. When defending Rome's refusal to recognize the orthodoxy of Peter the Fuller of Alexandria, who was accepted by Acacius of Constantinople, Gelasius writes:²¹ "Was it proper for the apostolic see to prefer the judgment of a bishop of Heraclea's district [*paroeciae Heraclensis ecclesiae*], I mean the Pontiff of Constantinople, or of some other bishops who were to be convoked with him, or because of him, when the Bishop of Constantinople refused to appear before the apostolic see which is the first see? This Bishop, even if he were adorned with the prerogative of a metropolitan, or even if he had a place among the [major] sees, had no right to ignore the decision of the first see before whose judgment he was called when the Bishop of the second see had appealed [to it] in accordance with the canons."

Anatolius, nec se praesumpsisse professus est, et in apostolicae sedis antistitis non negavit posita potestate; quae ideo . . . sedes apostolica non recepit, quia quae privilegiis universalis ecclesiae contraria probantur, nulla ratione sustinet. Similar passage in col. 107B; ed. Thiel, *Tract.* 4, p. 565, chap. 9.

²⁰ *PL. ibid.*, *Epist.* 13, cols. 71, 72; *Col. Avel.*, *Epist.* 95, pp. 387 seq.; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 26, pp. 405 seq., chap. 10.

²¹ *PL. ibid.*, col. 65C; *Col. Avel.*, *ibid.*, p. 376, 21; ed. Thiel, *ibid.*, p. 398, chap. 4.

APOSTOLICITY DURING THE ACACIAN SCHISM

A little further on, the Pope repeated with great emphasis:²² "It is thus sufficiently clear that Acacius had no authority to annul the decision of the apostolic see without any knowledge of it [by the latter]. Thus let them say: 'By what synod did he presume to do so? Even this he had no right to do without the [co-operation of] the apostolic see. The Bishop of what see? Of what metropolitan city [is he] the Pontiff? Is it not true that [he is the Bishop] of the district of the Church of Heraclea?'"

It is clear from these statements that Gelasius refused not only to count Constantinople among the greater sees, but even to recognize its metropolitan status. As has been seen from his *Tomus*, Gelasius interpreted Marcian's and Anatolius' letters to Leo very literally. He is even more outspoken in his letter to the bishops of Dardania:²³ "If the bishops of Constantinople flatter themselves because their city is the residence of the emperor, and think therefore that their persons are more important, let them listen to Marcian, the Princeps of that city. When, having interceded for the promotion of the priest of that city, he was not able to obtain anything that was contrary to the canons, he extended to Pope Leo of holy memory the highest praise, because he [the Pope] had not allowed the rules of the canons to be violated in any manner. Let them listen to Anatolius, the Pontiff of that same city, or better, to the clergy of Constantinople, confessing that they were trying to obtain the same thing, and affirming that all [this] was within the power of the apostolic bishop. And [let them listen to] the same blessed Pope Leo, head of the apostolic see, through whose authority the Synod of Chalcedon was confirmed, . . . to rescind by a competent refutation that which had again been attempted in a new way at that assembly, [and which] would be well outside the canons of Nicaea. Nonetheless, [they can hear] Probus, Bishop of the City of Canusa of holy memory, legate of the apostolic see under Pope Simplicius of blessed memory, teaching the same thing in the presence of the Princeps Leo, who asked then that it should not be attempted in

²² *PL*, *ibid.*, col. 66D; *Col. Avel.*, *ibid.*, p. 378; ed. Thiel, *ibid.*, p. 400, chap. 5: . . . *cujus sedis episcopus? Cujus metropolitanae civitatis antistes? Nonne paroeciae Heracliensis ecclesiae?*

²³ *PL*, *ibid.*, col. 72A,D; *Col. Avel.*, *ibid.*, pp. 388 seq.; ed. Thiel, *ibid.*, p. 406, chap. 10.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

any way, and refused resolutely to give his consent to it in any way, and therefore, let them not look at the status of any city, but let them [rather] properly observe the way of ecclesiastical order confirmed by the tradition of the Fathers.²⁴

Gelasius went even further. He established a sub-division of the three main sees in the Church, and declared that the incumbents of the major sees could be judged only by the bishop of the first – the apostolic see. Moreover, he was the first Pope to claim openly primacy of jurisdiction over the whole Church. He developed his teaching in three documents in particular: in his instructions to his legate, the Magister Faustus, in his letter to the Emperor Anastasius, and in the above-mentioned long letter to the bishops of Dardania. All three documents deal with the affairs of the Eastern Church.

In his instructions to Faustus Gelasius gave first a very broad interpretation of the canons of Sardica (343) which established the right of appeal from the judgment of metropolitans to that of the bishop of Rome: "These are the canons which decreed that appeals from the whole Church should be directed to this see. They have, however, by no means sanctioned an appeal [elsewhere] from [its judgment]; in this way they have ordained that it should sit in judgment over the whole Church, but that it should itself be judged by no-one, and never [have they ordered] that its judgment should be judged. They have stated that its decision should not be annulled, but rather ordered that its decrees should be followed."²⁵

The Bishop of Constantinople, the instructions continue, was assigned the role of executor of the Pope's decisions, and Acacius had acted in this role, according to the Pope, when he broke with

²⁴ Gelasius expresses similar ideas in his instruction to Faustus (*PL.*, *ibid.*, col. 29A): *Et Constantinopolitanae civitatis episcopus, quae utique per canones inter sedes nullum nomen accepit...*; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 10, p. 345, chap. 6.

²⁵ *PL.*, *ibid.*, col. 28B; ed. Thiel, *ibid.*, p. 344, chap. 5: *Ipsi sunt canones, qui appellationes totius ecclesiae ad hujus sedis examen voluere deferri ab ipsa vero nusquam prorsus appellari debere sanxerunt; ac per hoc illam de tota Ecclesia judicare, ipsam ad nullius commeare iudicium, nec de ejus unquam praeceperunt iudicio judicari, sententiamque illius constituerunt non oportere dissolvi, cujus potius decreta sequenda mandarunt.* Cf. also *ibid.*, col. 30B; ed. Thiel, *ibid.*, p. 347, chap. 9: *Si quantum ad religionem pertinet, non nisi apostolicae sedi juxta canones debetur summa iudicii totius; si quantum ad saeculi potestatem, illa a pontificibus, et praecipere a beati Petri vicario, debet cognoscere, quae divina sunt, non ipsa eadem judicare.*

APOSTOLICITY DURING THE ACACIAN SCHISM

Timothy of Alexandria and Peter of Antioch, who, with others, had been condemned, *sola sedis apostolicae auctoritate*. This was a rather daring statement, and Gelasius obviously realized it, for in the succeeding passage he tried to minimize the roles of the synods and of the Emperor in the incidents mentioned.

In his famous letter to Emperor Anastasius, Gelasius, after defining his doctrine on the two powers governing the world – *auctoritas sacra pontificum et regalia potestas*²⁶ – continued:²⁷ “If it is fitting that, in general, the faithful should subordinate their hearts to all priests who are correctly administering things divine, how much more should one endeavor to be in accord with the holder of the see, whom not only the divine will wished to be superior to all priests, but whom [also] the common piety of the Church following [the divine will] has continually celebrated [as such]. As your piety can clearly realize, never can anyone elevate himself through any human counsel whatever to that privilege or confession of him [Peter] whom the voice of Christ had placed above all, and whom the venerable Church has always confessed and reverently regarded as its primate. What has been established by divine decree can be attacked by human presumption; it cannot, however, be defeated by any power.”

Further on, when defending the condemnation of Acacius by Rome, Gelasius exclaimed:²⁸ “By a succession of canons of the Fathers and by a multiple tradition the authority of the apostolic see is established, since through all the Christian centuries it has been placed at the head of the Church.”

These declarations are particularly important because they are contained in an official letter addressed to the Emperor, and the

²⁶ Cf. F. Dvornik, “Pope Gelasius and Emperor Anastasius I,” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 44 (1951), pp. 111–116. A. Michel (“Der Kampf um das politische oder petrinische Prinzip der Kirchenführung,” in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, 2, ed. A. Grillmeier, H. Bacht [Würzburg, 1953], pp. 557–562) misunderstood the main core of the author’s thesis. It is the author’s intention to deal with this subject more thoroughly in his book on the *Origins of Christian Political Philosophy*, now in preparation. Cf. also P. Charanis, *Church and State in the Later Roman Empire. The Religious Policy of Anastasius the First* (Madison, Wis., 1939).

²⁷ *PL*, *ibid.*, cols. 42C,D, 43A; ed. Thiel, *Epist*, 12, pp. 551 seq. chaps. 2, 3.

²⁸ *PL*, *ibid.*, col. 45C; ed. Thiel, *ibid.*, p. 356, chap. 9: *Apostolicae vero sedis auctoritas quod cunctis saeculis Christianis Ecclesiae praelata sit universae, et canonum serie paternorum et multiplici traditione firmatur.*

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

Byzantines could thus clearly see to what extent claims resulting from the Petrine tradition might be advanced.

Gelasius was even more outspoken in his long letter to the bishops of Dardania who were especially susceptible to propaganda reaching Illyricum from Constantinople. In order to point out to them the minor position of the see of Constantinople in Church organization, Gelasius repeatedly spoke of the first, second, and third sees – Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch – stressing at the same time that the second and third sees could be judged only by the first.²⁹

In the letter or treatise addressed to the Eastern Bishops by Felix III, Gelasius, its true author, had already questioned the competence of Acacius to receive Peter Mongus into the Church, even if the latter had repented of his error of faith, for the only competent authority in this case was the Bishop of Alexandria who himself could not have so acted without reporting the matter to the Roman See.³⁰

This subordination of Alexandria and Antioch to Rome was proclaimed with particular forcefulness by Gelasius in his second treatise against Acacius, composed between the years 492 and 496. When speaking of the reception into the Church of Peter Mongus, Gelasius emphatically declared:^{30a} “But it will never be taught,

²⁹ *PL*, *ibid.*, col. 64A; *Col. Avel.*, p. 373; ed. Thiel, *ibid.*, p. 396, chap. 3: *Ioannes secundae sedis antistes . . . ad primae sedis audientiam cohortatus est, vel venire debere vel mittere. Licet enim synodus iteranda non esset, tamen congrueret, ut cuiuslibet civitatis episcopus primae sedis iudicium non vitaret, ad quod convenerat secundae sedis antistes, qui nisi a prima sede non posset audiri. PL*, *ibid.*, col. 65B; *Col. Avel.*, p. 375, ed. Thiel, *ibid.*, p. 397, chap. 4: *Cur . . . Iohannem, quem suis litteris impetebat, qualemcumque secundae sedis episcopum, in primae sedis beati Petri apostoli iudicio confutare despexit. Cf. also cols. 66B., 67B, 69C,D; Col. Avel.*, pp. 377, 379, 384; ed. Thiel, *ibid.*, pp. 399, chap. 4, 400, chap. 5, 403, chap. 7.

³⁰ *PL*, 58, col. 949B; ed. Thiel, *ibid.*, pp. 21 seq., *Epist.* 1, pp. 291 seq., chap. 9: *Siquidem Ecclesiae regula vetusque traditio nota sit omnibus: ab episcopo enim provinciae suae, id est secundae sedis antistite, eum vel discuti vel recipi convenisset. Qui tamen Alexandrinus antistes, . . . non prius hoc faceret, quam ad sedem apostolicam retulisset. Docent hoc catholici gesta Timothei, aliorumque exempla multorum, qui acceptis libellis hereticorum, . . . non prius receptionem eorum communionemque confirmant, quam ad hanc sedem satisfacientium gesta dirigerent, atque hinc poscerent, sicut factum est, debere firmari. Cf. also the very severe passage concerning the same incident in Gelasius' letter to the Eastern bishops (*PL*, 59, col. 93B,C; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 27, p. 426, chap. 4.*

^{30a} *PL*, *ibid.*, *Epist.* 14, *sive Tractatus*, col. 89A,B; ed. Thiel, *tract.* 2, p. 528, chap. 8.

APOSTOLICITY DURING THE ACACIAN SCHISM

never be shown, never be proved in any way that his cleansing (*purgatio*), which has not been performed according to competent rules, was legitimate. Because no-one would have been able either to expel or to demote the head of the second see without the consent of the first, neither should he [have done so]. Unless it were that the state of things was already so disturbed and confused, and that the first, second, and third sees were no longer respected and acknowledged according to the ancient statutes of the Fathers, and that after their head has been removed, as we see, all the members were in conflict with each other. For on what grounds should [honor] be paid (*deferendum*) to other sees if the traditional reverence (*reverentia*) is not paid to the first see, that of Blessed Peter, through which the dignity of all bishops is constantly being fortified and confirmed, and whose rank of honor (*honor*) is expressed through the invincible and unique judgment of the 318 Fathers?" Gelasius then quoted the classical argument for the Roman primacy (Matt. 16: 18.), adding to it the two passages from Luke's and John's Gospels (Luke 22:32; John 21:15-17). The whole passage is one of the most outspoken pleas for the Roman primacy written by Gelasius.

In his letter to the bishops of Dardania, the Pope defined the extent of the primatial powers. First he claimed the right to execute the decisions of the general councils. Basing his claim on the tradition of the Fathers, he declared:³¹ "Let no true Christian ignore the fact that the constitution of any synod which has been approved by the consent of the whole Church can be executed by no other see than the first, which confirms any synod by its authority and watches over it through continuous supervision, especially because of its principate, which Blessed Peter the Apostle obtained through the word of the Lord and which it has always retained and continues to retain . . ."

But, he continued, this was only one of the apostolic privileges; the apostolic see had the power to absolve any person from any sentence pronounced by any prelate:³² "The entire Church over the entire world knows that the chair of the Blessed Peter has the

³¹ *PL, ibid.*, col. 63B,C; *Col. Avel., Epist.* 95, p. 372; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 26, p. 395, chap. 3.

³² *PL, ibid.*, col. 66C; *Col. Avel.*, p. 378; ed. Thiel, *ibid.*, p. 399, chap. 5.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

right to loose what has been bound by the sentences of any bishop whatsoever, as the see of Peter is entitled to jurisdiction over any Church, while no one is entitled to pass judgment on its decision, for the canons have permitted that appeals should be directed to it from all the world, but no-one is permitted to appeal its decision."

This power extended also to the decisions of synods and was not bound by them:³³ "The apostolic see has often had the liberty (*facultas*), without a synod preceding it, to loose those whom a synod had unjustly condemned, and also, if necessary, to condemn others without the convocation of a synod."

The Pope then quoted some instances when, according to his interpretation, though not with strict historical truth, the Roman see had exercised this power: "an Eastern synod had rejected Athanasius of blessed memory; but the apostolic see took him up, denying confirmation of the condemnation by the Greeks, and acquitted him: in the same way a synod of catholic bishops had condemned, too, John [Chrysostom] of Constantinople; him also the apostolic see released merely by refusing to confirm the sentence. In the same way the apostolic see released Flavian of blessed memory, who was similarly condemned by an assembly of bishops, merely through not agreeing to his condemnation. Furthermore the apostolic see condemned by its authority Dioscorus, the Bishop of the second see, who had been admitted there; it dissolved the godless synod by refusing its concurrence, and for the sake of truth ordered, on its own authority, that the Synod of Chalcedon should be held."

It would be interesting to know what impression Gelasius' uncompromising attitude made on the Eastern Church in general, and particularly in Constantinople. Unfortunately, authentic documents emanating directly from the East in answer to the Pope's defense of his uncompromising position are missing, but Gelasius' writings give at least a few indications of how this attitude was received by Eastern bishops.

The first treatise, in which Gelasius dealt with some objections sent by the Easterners to Felix III gives an insight into the thinking

³³ *PL*, *ibid.*, col. 67B,C; *Col. Avel.* p. 379; ed. Thiel, *ibid.*, p. 400, chap. 5.

APOSTOLICITY DURING THE ACACIAN SCHISM

of the Eastern clergy. Their position, insofar as it can be determined, implies that the idea that the universality of the Church should be represented by and merged with the universality of the Empire still predominated in the East, but they declared that such an uncompromising attitude on the part of the Pope, endangered the whole Church,³⁴ and that it was in the interest of the Empire to show a more compromising spirit even in matters which concerned the Creed.³⁵

The Pope's definitions of the extent of his primacy must have frequently bewildered the Easterners; one special instance being his letter to the Emperor Anastasius. In this Gelasius complained that the Easterners termed him "proud and arrogant."³⁶ This, however, did not mean that they rejected outright his claims to the primacy, because, in his first treatise, Gelasius quoted the Easterners as saying that the Pope "is diminishing his own privileges because of his stubbornness."³⁷

Moreover, they apparently found the Roman see's condemnation of bishops, without announcement to the Easterners and without synodal procedure, very strange and contrary to tradition. The Pope's answers to those accusations show particular irritation.³⁸

³⁴ PL, 58, col. 961A; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 1, p. 305, chap. 32: *Sed obstinatione vestra, inquis, in periculum causam totius Ecclesiae adducitis.*

³⁵ PL, *ibid.*, col. 958C; ed. Thiel, *ibid.*, p. 303, chap. 29: *Sed nunc, inquis, utilitatis interest reipublicae. Sed sacerdos allegare debuit, utilitatis interesse potius publicae, ut divina communio et fides integra servaretur....*

³⁶ *Commonitorium ad Faustum*, PL, 59, *Epist.* 4, col. 30A; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 10, p. 346, chap. 9: *isti sedem beati Petri apostoli blasphemare praesumunt... et nos insuper superbos esse pronuntiant. Epist. ad Anastasium, ibid.*, col. 46C,D; ed. Thiel, p. 358, chap. 12: *Sed adhuc apostolicam sedem... superbam vocare arrogantemque contendunt... si nos superbi sumus... si nos elatis sumus...*

³⁷ PL, 58, col. 961A; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 1, p. 305, chap. 33: *Sed apostolicae sedis dignitatem ista obstinatione minuitis...*, col. 965C; ed. Thiel, p. 310, chap. 4: *sed privilegia, inquis, vestra hac obstinatione minuitis. Igitur ne minus juris habeamus, efficiamur haeretici, et ne amittamus ecclesiasticae privilegia potestatis, amittamus ipsam religionem....*

³⁸ *Commonitorium ad Faustum*, PL., 59, *Epist.* 4, cols. 27C,D, 28B; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 10, pp. 342, chap. 3, 343, chaps. 4, 5: *Ostendant, qui nobis canones nituntur apponere, quibus hoc canonibus, quibus regulis qua lectione, quove documento... sive factum est unquam, vel faciendum esse mandatur.... Euphemium vero miror, si ignorantiam suam ipse non perspicit, qui dicit Acacium ab uno non potuisse damnari. Itane non perspicit, secundum formam synodi Chalcedonensis, Acacium fuisse damnatum?... Nobis opponunt canones, dum nesciunt quid loquantur. Epist. ad episcopos orientales, PL, *ibid.*, *Epist.* 15, cols. 94C,D., 95A, 97A,C; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 27, pp. 429, chaps. 6, 7,*

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

Such accusations and the Pope's brisk and sometimes biting replies naturally failed to ease the tension between East and West. In some of Gelasius' letters an air of superiority toward "the Greeks" can be detected. He was puzzled by the attitude of the Greeks, who could not comprehend the logic of his deductions, and enjoyed their own *combinationi* with the Creed as defined by the Council of Chalcedon.³⁹ Here, perhaps for the first time, a papal document comments on Greek unreliability in matters of faith. Gelasius launched the accusation against the Greeks by saying that heretics were "at home" with them,⁴⁰ an accusation which developed later into a general condemnation of Greeks as heretics and schismatics by the entire West.

Thus there is no doubt that during the papacy of Gelasius the relationship between East and West deteriorated considerably. The Pope could rightly boast that he was defending the Creed defined by Leo the Great, and confirmed by the Council of Chalcedon. The Easterners, though in the majority, were in the wrong; but, although they made a few attempts at reconciliation, Gelasius made little, if any, effort to meet them halfway. He could not, of course, compromise the Creed, and for this he deserves the gratitude of all orthodox Christians, but there are ways and means of saying and doing the right thing in the right way, and in this respect Gelasius was not adept. Under similar circumstances St. Leo the Great had also shown admirable firmness, but, at the same time, he devised a way of handling the Greeks that was effective without being excessively offensive to their sensibilities.

432, chap. 9, 433, chap. 10: *An de uno dolet Acacio, quod speciali synodo non fuerit confutatus, cum proprium crimen suis litteris ipse delegerit Certe quod sedes apostolica decreverat, Orientalibus episcopis non innotuisse jactatur. . . . Hic vobis synodus numquam venit in mentem, et certe de personis, ut dictum est, nulla veteri lege constrictis. . . . Dicitis, synodum in unius hominis persona debuisse tractari, quam in damnandis tantis pontificibus catholicis non quaesistis. . . .*

³⁹ *Epist. XV ad episc. orientales, PL, ibid., cols. 98D, 99A; ed Thiel, ibid., pp. 434, chap. 11, 435, chap. 12: Sed haec apud Graecos facilis et inculpabilis putatur esse permixtio, apud quos nulla est veri falsique discretio; et cum omnibus reprobis volunt esse communes, in nulla monstrantur probitate constare.* This is of course a gross exaggeration explainable only by the "heat of the struggle."

⁴⁰ *Epist. III ad episcopos Dardaniae, PL, ibid., col. 23B; ed. Thiel, Epist. 7, p. 335, chap. 2: Apud Graecos, quibus multas haereses abundare non dubium est.*

APOSTOLICITY DURING THE ACACIAN SCHISM

Of course, since the reign of Leo the Great, events had occurred which inevitably increased the tension between East and West. The Acacian schism was a serious affair. Gelasius' firmness, however, certainly impressed the Westerners, and the prestige of the Roman see undoubtedly grew in the West because of the Pope's uncompromising attitude. This is very clearly illustrated by the acclamations of the enthusiastic Western prelates who gathered in Rome in 495 to receive back into the Church the legate Misenus. The latter, when sent by Felix III to Constantinople, communicated with Acacius, and was accordingly anathematized by the Pope. The prelates not only invoked St. Peter to intercede for Gelasius, but acclaimed the Pope as vicar of Christ.⁴¹

Dionysius Exiguus, the author of the famous Collection of Papal Decrees, transmitted to posterity the sentiments of admiration and gratitude felt for their master by Gelasius' disciples. In the introduction to his Collection, dedicated to Cardinal Julian, his benefactor and Gelasius' disciple, Dionysius inserted a long eulogy on Gelasius, exalting his humility, his labors for the Church, his charity and chastity, and calling him "a shepherd and an imitator of the supreme good Shepherd—a chosen head of the apostolic see who obeyed and taught the precepts of God."⁴²

In spite of the bitterness that Gelasius' firmness and sharp criticism may have left in their hearts, the Easterners were impressed by the Pope's emphasis on the apostolic character of his see, and by the deductions he made from the fact that he was the successor of St. Peter. A perusal of the correspondence addressed to Gelasius and to his successors from the Eastern part of the Empire during the last stage of the Acacian schism shows clearly that the apostolicity of the Roman see was stressed more and more by the Easterners.

⁴¹ *PL. ibid.*, col. 190C; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 30, p. 447; *Col. Avel. Epist.* 103, p. 487: *Omnes episcopi et presbyteri surgentes in synodo acclamaverunt: "Exaudi, Christe, Gelasio vita!" dictum quindecies. "Domine Petre, tu illum serva!" dictum duodecies. "Cujus sedem et annos!" dictum septies. "Vicarium Christi te videmus!" dictum undecies. "Apostolum Petrum te videmus!" dictum sexies. "Cujus sedem et annos!" dictum septies trigesies.*

⁴² *Dionysii Exigui Collectio decretorum pontificum Romanorum*, *PL*, 67, cols. 231 seq. Cf. Thiel, pp. 286, 287. See Caspar, *Geschichte*, 2, pp. 79 seq. Caspar ends his history of Gelasius very fittingly with this quotation of Dionysius' eulogy.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

The letters of Eastern prelates to Gelasius are not preserved, and it is impossible to reconstruct from his replies the titles they bestowed on him. Only a letter of the bishops of Dardania to Gelasius in 494 is extant. In this the prelates of that part of Illyricum assured the Pope of their fidelity to the faith of Chalcedon and to the apostolic see. The letter⁴³ is addressed *Domino, sancto, apostolico et beatissimo patri patrum Gelasio papae urbis Romae*, and is written with great respect and in a very devout spirit. The bishops declared that they would always obey the admonitions and follow the directives given to them by the "apostolic see," and asked "his apostolate" to send a legate from his "angelic see" with further instructions.

It was natural that the bishops of the Latin part of Illyricum, which belonged to the patriarchate of Rome, would hold the popes in high esteem, and willingly recognize all claims based on the apostolic and Petrine origin of their see. But, in view of the intensive propaganda to which the bishops of Illyricum were subjected by the followers of Acacius—which as we have seen, had deeply impressed the vicars of the popes, the metropolitans of Thessalonica—the declaration of the bishops of Dardania carries some weight.

However, even the prelates of the three Eastern patriarchates were impressed by the claims formulated so boldly in Gelasius' letters, and by the uncompromising attitude of the Roman papacy. This is best illustrated in the letter addressed by the orthodox Eastern prelates to Gelasius' second successor, Pope Symmachus (498–514). It is a very moving plea for help addressed by Eastern Christendom to the head of the Church, the Bishop of Rome. The orthodox bishops, who were deprived of their sees because of their refusal to follow Acacius and his allies in Alexandria and Antioch, first recalled Christ's parables of the lost sheep and the pieces of silver (Luke

⁴³ PL, 59, cols. 21 seq., Col. Avel., Epist. 80, pp. 233–225; ed. Thiel, Epist. 11, pp. 348 seq: ...*patrum in omnibus custodientes praecepta et inviolabilia sacrosanctorum canonum instituta sectantes apostolicae et singulari illi sedi vestrae communi fide et devotione parere contendimus Apostolatus vester dignetur admittere Unum ex angelica sede vestra . . . ad nos usque praecipite destinare, ut sub ejus praesentia, quae fides orthodoxa et vestrae iussuomnis sinceritas postulat, ordinentur*

APOSTOLICITY DURING THE ACACIAN SCHISM

15:4 seq.), and then appealed to the Pope in a most passionate way:⁴⁴

"We recalled this, o most holy one, daring to plead neither for one lost sheep, nor for the loss of one drachma, but for the salvation, dear to us, of both the Eastern parts and of most of the three divisions of the habitable world, which were redeemed from the sinful state transmitted by the parents, not with perishable silver or gold, but with the precious blood of the Lamb of God. So teaches the blessed prince of the most glorious apostles [I Pet. 1:18], whose chair Christ, the best shepherd, had entrusted to you, who came to seek and to free what was lost, and who gave his soul for the redemption of many. In imitating him, most holy and most blessed one, hasten to help us, as the blessed Paul, your teacher, once hastened to help the Macedonians [Acts 16] You are taught daily by your holy teacher, Peter, to tend the sheep of Christ entrusted to you over the whole habitable world, which were gathered, not by force, but by their own will; you who, with the most learned Paul, cry to us who are subject to you, saying, 'We are not dominating you in faith, but collaborating in joy' [II, Cor. 1:24] But all of us, both the orthodox who are in communion and [also] those who are abstaining from communion, wait upon both God and you for the light of visitation and reception (*assumptio*). Thus, hasten to help the East, whence the Saviour of the Universe sent two great lights, Peter and Paul, to illuminate the whole world."

This is one of the most straightforward acknowledgments by Eastern prelates of Roman primacy in the Church, and it is somewhat surprising that Symmachus should have paid almost no attention to so moving and sincere a plea. The letter of October 8, 512,⁴⁵ regarded by some as the Pope's answer to the plea of the orthodox Easterners, was in reality addressed to the prelates of Illyricum. At the end of the missive they were warned that if they paid no heed to papal admonition, they would find themselves in the same unfortunate situation as the Church of Constantinople. This attitude was resented by the Easterners who felt that Rome,

⁴⁴ Symmachus, *Epistolae et Decreta*, PL, 62, cols. 56 seq.; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 12, pp. 709 seq.

⁴⁵ PL, *ibid.*, *Epist.* 7, cols. 61-63; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 13, pp. 717-722. Cf. Caspar, *op. cit.*, p. 123.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

while boasting of its own orthodoxy, was not doing enough to help others to attain it; or so at least their use, in their plea, of Paul's epistle [II Cor. 1:24] seems to indicate, and Symmachus' silence could easily have given them the impression that their resentment was not groundless.

Further evidence of respect and recognition of the apostolic character of the Roman see is to be found in other documents that reached Pope Hormisda (514-523) from the East during the last phase of the Acacian schism, for the liquidation of which the Pope had labored from the beginning of his reign. In a letter dated January 12, 515, Dorotheus, the Metropolitan of Thessalonica, hailed Hormisda as a true peace maker and "champion of the true faith, who never errs," who—as from a tower—calls to unity the separated members of the Church "which Christ our God has entrusted to you." Dorotheus wrote: "I write to you and address the blessed person of your holiness, showing that I am one in joy with the blessed see of the most holy Apostle Peter, which is governed by such a hand. . . ." ^{45a} He also professed that he learned to respect the Roman see from the tradition of the Holy Fathers, and expressed the wish that "through the humanity of our Lord and God, Jesus Christ, and through the intercession of the Apostle Peter, most blessed above all, and Paul, the most wise above all, due honor may in justice be given and reserved to their see and to your beatitude, in order that in your time the apostolic see may obtain with due honor something like a second principate, so that all discord may be banned from the Church." He expressed at the end of his letter the hope that "all that which is due to the venerable see of Peter, who is blessed above all, shall be given to it when the Church shall again be united in peace."

The above declaration assumes even greater importance when the ambiguous attitude of Dorotheus and his predecessor Andrew ⁴⁶ in the Acacian controversy is taken into consideration.

Even the Emperor Anastasius seems in one instance to have moved in this direction, for, together with Dorotheus' letter, the

^{45a} Hormisda, *Epistolae et Decreta*, PL, 63, cols. 371 seq.; *Col. Avel.*, *Epist.* 105, pp. 495 seq.; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 3, pp. 742 seq.

⁴⁶ On their attitude, see Caspar, *op. cit.*, pp. 55, 84 seq., 131 seq., 165 seq.

APOSTOLICITY DURING THE ACACIAN SCHISM

Pope received an epistle sent by the Emperor to "the most holy and pious Archbishop and Patriarch Hormisda,"⁴⁷ in which Anastasius expressed his relief on learning that the Roman see was then occupied by someone noted for his mild and conciliatory character. It was, in fact, this realization that had induced the Emperor to resume correspondence with the Roman see, and "to request what God and our Saviour had taught the holy apostles through His divine exhortation, and especially the blessed Peter, in whom he founded the strength of His Church." Anastasius first mentioned new religious troubles in the province of Scythia, bordering on Illyricum, whither discontent with the Emperor's religious policy, exploited by Vitalian for his own political advancement, had spread from Illyricum. Then he announced his intention of having these questions decided in a council, and asked "his apostolate" to play the role of intermediary (*mediatorem se apostolatus vester faciat*).

However, the papal legates, sent to Constantinople in the hope that they would find the Emperor well-disposed to change his religious policy, discovered otherwise, and returned to Rome with another imperial letter⁴⁸ which made clear that Anastasius was persevering in his original attitude, and which declared that the *Henoticon* was in accord with the decisions of Chalcedon. But, withal, Anastasius sought to conclude in a more conciliatory tone, and closed his letter calling the Pope *apostolatus vester*, thus recognizing the apostolic and Petrine character of the Roman see.

The papal legates were given a document to be signed by bishops renouncing the schism. It was the famous *Libellus Hormisdæ* containing a clear definition of Roman primacy in matters of faith. The following excerpt is most relevant to our inquiry:⁴⁹ "The first [condition of] salvation is to preserve the rule of the true faith, and not to deviate in any way from the constitutions of the Fathers.

⁴⁷ *PL, ibid.*, cols. 369 seq.; *Col. Avel., Epist.* 107, pp. 499 seq.; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 2, p. 742.

⁴⁸ *PL, ibid.*, cols. 381 seq.; *Col. Avel., Epist.* 125, pp. 537-540; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 10, pp. 761-764.

⁴⁹ *PL, ibid.*, col. 393; *Col. Avel., Epist.* 116b, pp. 520 seq.; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 7, pp. 754 seq. On the text and editions of the *Libellus*, see Caspar. *op. cit.*, pp. 764 seq. Cf. also W. Haacke, "Die Glaubensformel des Papstes Hormisdas im Acacianischen Schisma," *Analecta Gregoriana*, 20 (Rome, 1939), pp. 106-150.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

And because the declaration of Our Lord Jesus Christ cannot be omitted, saying 'Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church,' these words have been proved true by events, for in the apostolic see the Catholic religion has always been kept immaculate. Therefore, desiring not to be separated in any way from this hope and faith, and following in everything the constitutions of the Fathers, we anathematize all heresies. . . ."

After enumerating all heretics, from Nestorius to Acacius, whom the bishops were asked to condemn, the *Libellus* continues: "Thus, as we have said, in following in all things the apostolic see and in professing all its constitutions, I hope that I will deserve to remain in the same communion with you which is professed by the apostolic see, in which persists the total and true strength of the Christian religion. Promising also not to recite in the liturgy the names of men who have been separated from communion with the Catholic Church, which means who do not agree with the apostolic see. . . ."

Although the *Libellus* appeared unacceptable to many in the East, it must be admitted that Hormisda manifested some restraint in its composition. Almost certainly Gelasius or Symmachus would have expressed themselves in far more resolute and less restrained terms, making the acceptance of the *Libellus* by the Easterners even more difficult.

Some declarations made by the Easterners went far toward accepting Roman claims and must also be recalled. Anastasius' religious policy found many opponents, as has already been noted, and this was cleverly exploited by the ambitious Goth Vitalian, to whom Anastasius had to yield, at least for a time, by appointing him *magister militum* and commandant of Thracian troops.⁵⁰ The long-protracted schism created some weariness among many Easterners, and inclined them toward a final reconciliation with Rome.

All of this explains why the *Libellus*, though undoubtedly read with mixed feelings by many, did not encounter wholesale disapproval in the East. The bishops of Illyricum were the first to sign it. John, Bishop-elect of Nicopolis, expressed his consent in a letter⁵¹

⁵⁰ Cf. for details L. Duchesne, *L'Eglise au VI^e siècle* (Paris, 1925), pp. 37 seq.

⁵¹ *PL*, *ibid.*, cols. 387 seq.; *Col. Avel.*, *Epist.* 117, pp. 522-523; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 15, pp. 770-772.

APOSTOLICITY DURING THE ACACIAN SCHISM

sent at the beginning of October 516 to "My Lord the most holy and most blessed Father of Fathers, colleague in the ministry, and Prince of Bishops Hormisda." In this he asked the Pope "to take care of all Churches and of that of Nicopolis according to the habit of your apostolic see (*iuxta consuetudinem apostolicae sedis vestrae*)," and to send back the bearer of the letter Rufinus "with spiritual and apostolic instructions."

The bishops of Epirus, who met in a local synod for John's election, followed the example of their new metropolitan. Their letter⁵² gave the Pope the same title as John's and they assured him that they persisted in communion with "the apostolic see" as did John's predecessor Alcison, who died in Constantinople where he had met the Roman legates. Asking for confirmation of the election of John as his successor, they declared that he had always followed the Pope's "apostolic admonitions."

Previously the Pope had announced to Bishop Caesarius of Arles⁵³ the defection of many Illyrian bishops from Dorotheus of Thessalonica because the latter was afraid to break off his relations with Timothy of Constantinople, who had been appointed by Anastasius and who replaced the orthodox Macedonius.⁵⁴ Now the Pope was pleased to let Avitus, Bishop of Vienne, know of this new success.⁵⁵

Hormisda obtained even greater satisfaction soon afterward from Syria Secunda. The monks who were particularly numerous in that province remained faithful to Chalcedon, and opposed the religious policy of the new Patriarch of Antioch, Severus. When they had organized a mass pilgrimage to the tomb of St. Symeon the Stylite, in protest against Severus, the latter let them be attacked by his adherents. A massacre followed, and three hundred and fifty monks

⁵² *PL*, cols. 389 seq.; *Col. Avel., Epist.* 119, pp. 526-528; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 16, pp. 772-774.

⁵³ *PL*, *ibid.*, *Epist.* 30, cols. 431 seq.; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 9, pp. 758-761.

⁵⁴ See for details, E. Müller. "Fragments inédits de Théodore le Lecteur et de Jean d'Egée," *Revue archéologique* N.S., 26 (1873), pp. 396-400. Theodore says that forty bishops from Illyricum and Greece had broken off relations with Dorotheus. Cf. also Theophanes, *Chronographia*, *ad. an.* 6008, ed. Bonn, p. 250; de Boor, p. 162.

⁵⁵ *PL*, *ibid.*, *Epist.* 10, cols. 394 seq.; *Col. Avel., Epist.* 137, pp. 560-564; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 22, pp. 783-786.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

were killed. The survivors appealed to Hormisdas for help,⁵⁶ and the form of address employed in their letter to him clearly shows how greatly the prestige of the Roman see had risen in the eyes of orthodox Easterners, and how readily they accepted the Pope's claims based on the apostolic and Petrine character of his see. The monks addressed Hormisdas as "the most holy and most blessed Patriarch of the universe, holding the see of the Prince of the Apostles, Peter," and continued: "Thus, because Christ, our God, had instituted a head of the shepherds and a physician and a surgeon of souls, it is fitting that we expose to your holy person the suffering which had befallen us." After relating how Severus, Patriarch of Antioch, and Peter, Bishop of Apamia, the heads of the heretics, were vilifying the decrees of Chalcedon, and persecuting the orthodox, the monks exclaimed:

"We beseech you thus, O most blessed one, entreating and supplicating you: arise with fervor and zeal and take just pity on the torn body—because you are the head of all—and vindicate the despised faith, the trampled canons, the Fathers covered with blasphemies, and such a Synod threatened with anathema (*anathemate impetitam*). To you is given the power and the authority to bind and to loose . . . arise, o holy Father, come to our salvation. Be the imitator of Christ the Lord who came from Heaven on earth in order to look for the erring sheep, the one Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, whose chair you are adorning, and Paul who is the vessel of election, who during their travels have illuminated the whole world."

One could hardly look for a more touching appeal for help, and a more frank recognition of Rome's claims to primacy from an Easterner. Hormisdas was moved, and, unlike Symmachus who had left a similar appeal unanswered, he promptly dispatched a long letter⁵⁷ consoling the persecuted monks and encouraging them to continue their fight for the orthodox faith.

⁵⁶ *PL*, *ibid.*, cols. 410 seq.; *Col. Avel.*, *Epist.* 139, pp. 565–571; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 39, pp. 814–819: *Sanctissimo et beatissimo universi orbis terrae patriarchae Hormisdasae continenti sedem principis apostolorum Petri deprecatio*. . . .

⁵⁷ *PL*, *ibid.*, *Epist.* 23, cols. 415–422; *Col. Avel.*, *Epist.* 140, pp. 572–585; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 40, pp. 820–830. Cf. E. Caspar, *op. cit.*, 2, pp. 148 seq. The Pope wrote while the impression of a bitter letter he had received from the Emperor Anastasius was still in his mind (*PL*, *ibid.*, cols. 409 seq.; *Col. Avel.*,

APOSTOLICITY DURING THE ACACIAN SCHISM

The death of Anastasius, who was succeeded by Justin I (518–527), opened the way to a final reconciliation between East and West. This reconciliation became even easier when Justinian, during the reign of his uncle, took the direction of political and religious affairs into his own hands. The correspondence of Rome with the East, especially with Constantinople, was very lively during the negotiations leading to a final reconciliation, and many letters written by Easterners contain expressions of particular interest for this study.

The Emperor Justin I was very brief in his first two letters announcing his election and the intention of his Patriarch John II to make peace with the Pope.⁵⁸ He was more eloquent in the letter of April 22, 519,⁵⁹ notifying the Pope that the *Libellus* had been signed by John of Constantinople. There he addressed the Pope as "the most blessed Archbishop and Patriarch." When speaking of Acacius and his followers he said that they "were either the first who acted in opposition to the apostolic constitutions, or became successors in error." By these words the Emperor could have meant the papal constitutions, from Felix III onward.

In two others letters (dated 520) Justin called the Roman see the "apostolic see,"⁶⁰ and on two other occasions he addressed the Pope as *apostolatus vester*.⁶¹ The latter title is used more often by Justin's nephew, Justinian, who also called the Roman see "apostolic."⁶² In his letter of August 31, 520, Justinian spoke of the "primacy

Epist. 138, pp. 564 seq.; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 38, pp. 813 seq). It is the author's intention to treat the political ideas contained in the imperial and papal correspondence of this period in his book *The Origins of Christian Political Philosophy*, now in preparation.

⁵⁸ *PL, ibid.*, cols. 426 seq.; *Col. Avel., Epist.* 141, 143, pp. 586 seq.; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 41, 42, pp. 830 seq.: *Justinus Augustus Hormisdæ papæ*.

⁵⁹ *PL, ibid.*, cols. 450 seq.; *Col. Avel., Epist.* 160, pp. 610–612; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 66, pp. 861 seq. On Justin's religious policy see A. A. Vasiliev, *Justin the First*, *Dumbarton Oaks Studies*, 1 (Cambridge, Mass., 1950), pp. 132–221.

⁶⁰ *PL, ibid.*, col. 486D; *Col. Avel., Epist.* 192, p. 649, 3; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 116, p. 918. *PL, ibid.*, col. 486A; *Col. Avel., Epist.* 193, p. 651, 2; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 114, p. 915, 1.

⁶¹ *PL, ibid.*, col. 499B; *Col. Avel., Epist.* 199, p. 658, 1; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 126 p. 938. *PL, ibid.*, col. 522D; *Col. Avel., Epist.* 241, p. 740; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 145, p. 983.

⁶² *PL, ibid.*, col. 430D; *Col. Avel., Epist.* 147, p. 592; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 44, p. 833; *PL, ibid.*, col. 475B,C; *Col. Avel., Epist.* 187, p. 644, 2, 3; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 78, p. 875, chap. 1; *PL, ibid.*, cols. 496A, 497A; *Col. Avel., Epist.* 196,

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

of the apostolic see,"⁶³ and in that of September 9, 520, he stressed the Pope's succession to St. Peter.⁶⁴

In their correspondence with the Patriarch of Rome, the Patriarchs of Constantinople—John II and Epiphanius—followed established protocol even more consistently than either Justin or Justinian. Their letters bear, with insignificant deviations, the conventional form of address: *Domino meo et per omnia Dei amatori sanctissimo fratri et comministro Hormisdæ*..., but acknowledge the apostolic character of the Roman see. The new Patriarch John II (518–520), when announcing to Hormisdæ the change in religious policy that had taken place in Constantinople, asks him to "write in an apostolic style," and to accept the answer in a brotherly way for the love of God. At the end of this same letter he requested the Pope to send legates to Constantinople who "would be worthy of your apostolic see."⁶⁵

Although ready at this time for reunion with Rome, the Patriarch John found it rather difficult to sign the *Libellus*, as requested by the Pope. One of the Pope's legates, the Deacon Dioscorus, reported to Hormisdæ⁶⁶ that, after some discussion, the Patriarch consented to sign, but asked whether he could take the liberty of adding a few words of introduction. His request was granted, and in his short

pp. 655, 2, 656, 7; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 120, p. 921, chaps. 1, 4; *PL, ibid.*, cols. 507D, 508A,B; *Col. Avel., Epist.* 200, pp. 659, 660, 4; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 127, p. 939 (*apostolico patri, apostolatus vester, apostolica sedes*); *PL*, col. 509A; *Col. Avel., Epist.* 235, pp. 715, 1, 716, 5; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 132, pp. 954, 955; *PL, ibid.*, col. 510A; *Col. Avel., Epist.* 243, p. 743; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 135, p. 957.

⁶³ *PL, ibid.*, col. 508; *Col. Avel., Epist.* 200, p. 660, 4; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 127 p. 939: *Aeternitatis igitur supernae tremendique iudicii non immemor sanctitas vestra, quae sibi commissa sunt, efficaciae tradi deproperet, ut intellegant cuncti recte vos apostolicae sedis esse primatum sortitos.*

⁶⁴ *PL, ibid.*, col. 509A; *Col. Avel., Epist.* 235, p. 716, 5; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 132, p. 955: *Ostendat ergo tuus apostolatus, [quod merito] Petro successit apostolo, quoniam dominus a vobis utpote summis pastoribus exacturus est universorum salutem, qui poterunt esse salvi firmata concordia.*

⁶⁵ *PL, ibid.*, col. 429; *Col. Avel., Epist.* 146, pp. 591, 1, 592, 5; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 43, pp. 832, chap. 1, 833, chap. 2: *scribere igitur apostolice et rescripta suscipere fraterne Dei amore dignemini... rogamus vos pacificos viros destinare et vestrae dignos apostolicae sedis.* See also his letter of April, 519, *PL, ibid.*, col. 450B; *Col. Avel., Epist.* 161, p. 613, 7; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 67, p. 864, chap. 3.

⁶⁶ *PL, ibid.*, col. 447C,D; *Col. Avel., Epist.* 167, p. 620, 10, 11; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 65, p. 860, chap. 4.

APOSTOLICITY DURING THE ACACIAN SCHISM

preface John stressed the union of the two Churches as follows:⁶⁷ *Sanctissimas enim dei ecclesias, id est superioris vestrae et novellae istius Romae unam esse accipio; illam sedem apostoli Petri et istius augustae civitatis unam esse definio.*

Although it is evident from this that the Patriarch attempted to hide the fact that he had to sign a document dictated by the Pope; although he tried to give the impression that he was not obliged to do so, since, in his own words, he would have made identical professions; and although he endeavored here to put both sees on the same level, it should be pointed out that in fact he attributed the apostolic character not to his own see, but to Rome alone.

In the same preface John, continuing his declaration stressed that he was accepting the decisions of the Four Oecumenical Councils. This statement might have been a deliberate manoeuvre. The oecumenicity of the Council of Constantinople (381) had not then been explicitly recognized by the Roman see, and this recognition might have been a tacit condition to Constantinople's readiness to agree to a concession demanded by Rome.

John had already mentioned the Four Oecumenical Councils in his first letter.⁶⁸ The Pope, in his reply, contented himself with mentioning the councils in general, but singled out the Council of Chalcedon as a guide, which John had promised to follow,⁶⁹ and John's emphasis on the Four Councils in the second patriarchal letter must have been intentional. Although in his letter of thanks to John⁷⁰ Hormisda avoided any allusion to the Four Councils, the oecumenicity of the Council of Constantinople was tacitly recognized by Rome. Justinian, writing on June 29, 519, spoke of the

⁶⁷ PL, *ibid.*, col. 444A; Col. Avel., *Epist.* 159, p. 608, 2; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 61, p. 852, chap. 1.

⁶⁸ PL, *ibid.*, col. 429; Col. Avel., *Epist.* 146, p. 591, 2; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 43, p. 832, chap. 1: *Ego enim inquisibili ratione doctrinam sanctorum apostolorum secundum traditionem sanctorum patrum tenens similiter honorem consubstantiali et per omnia sanctae Trinitati offero, sicut in Nicaea 318 coetus promulgavit et in Constantinopoli 150 conventus firmavit et in Ephesina [200] concursio firmavit et in Chalcedone conventus catholicus signavit.*

⁶⁹ PL, *ibid.*, *Epist.* 29, col. 430A; Col. Avel., *Epist.* 145, p. 589, 3; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 47, p. 836, chap. 2: *dilectionis tuae confessionem gratanter accepimus, per quam sanctae synodi comprobantur, inter quas Chalcedonem . . .*

⁷⁰ PL, *ibid.*, *Epist.* 45, cols. 455 seq.; Col. Avel., *Epist.* 169, pp. 624-626, ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 80, pp. 879-881.

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

Four Councils as a matter of course.⁷¹ This was the practice in the East, as Hormisda had already learned from the letter of the Bishop of Nicopolis, who also spoke of the Four Councils as the source of the true faith.⁷²

John's successor, too, the Patriarch Epiphanius (520–536), in his letter to Hormisda announcing his enthronement, enumerated the Four Councils which had defined the true faith. After writing of his election, Epiphanius said:⁷³ "Therefore I thought it necessary to include in my letter this first announcement in order to show how I am disposed toward your apostolic see. It is my greatest desire to be united with you and to embrace the divine doctrines which have been entrusted to your holy see by the blessed and holy disciples and God's apostles, especially by Peter the head of the apostles, and to esteem nothing more than them."

Epiphanius further promised to preach the true faith to his Churches, and to keep them always united with himself and with the Pope, "since they should always be united and inviolate, and belong to the one body of the common apostolic see and always preserve it as such."⁷⁴ Here again the translation is ambiguous, and it is not clear whether, by the "apostolic Church" he meant the whole Church or the Roman Church. The see of Rome was, however, designated as apostolic in the next passage, although at the beginning of the letter the see of Constantinople was called only *sedes . . . sanctae ecclesiae catholicae regiae urbis*.

In September 520 Epiphanius addressed another letter to the Pope in which he recommended moderation in the Pope's con-

⁷¹ *PL, ibid.*, col. 475C; *Col. Avel., Epist.* 187, p. 644, 2; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 78, p. 875, chap. 1.

⁷² *PL, ibid.*, col. 387C,D; *Col. Avel., Epist.* 117, p. 523, 5, 6; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 15, p. 771, chap. 2.

⁷³ *PL, ibid.*, cols. 494 seq.: *Col. Avel., Epist.* 195, pp. 652–654; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 121, pp. 923–925. The letter is evidently a translation from the Greek original. The translation is occasionally rather clumsy, as in the following passage: *Est mihi oratio magnopere, beatissime, unire me vobis et divina amplecti dogmata, quae ex beatis et sanctis discipulis et apostolis Dei, praecipue summi Petri apostolorum, sedi sanctae vestrae sunt tradita . . .*

⁷⁴ *Vobis enim manifestum feci, et sub me ecclesiis haec praedico, festinans per omnia eas mihi et vestrae beatitudini vinculo caritatis adunari, quas omnino oportet unitas esse et inviolabiles et corpus unum communis apostolicae ecclesiae eundemque perpetuo custodire . . . Quos vestra apostolica sedes condemnans in sacris diptychis recitare non iussit . . .*

APOSTOLICITY DURING THE ACACIAN SCHISM

ditions for reconciliation, thus supporting the Emperor's request that the elimination of Acacius' name from the *dyptica* should suffice. In this he mentions again the Four Councils and, including Constantinople among the major sees, he speaks of the unity of the "two patriarchal sees." At the end, however, in his description of the gifts he sent to the Pope, he calls the Roman see apostolic.⁷⁵

The imperial embassy, which brought imperial and patriarchal letters to Hormisda, gave him also a written report of the synod of Constantinople that had elected Epiphanius to the patriarchal dignity.⁷⁶ The Pope, in these communications, is addressed as "Father of Fathers, Archbishop and Patriarch." It is interesting to read in the report a clear allusion to the main argument used in Rome for the primacy (Matt. 16:18) though interpreted in the Byzantine way, namely, that the rock on which the Church is built is the "true incorrupt faith" professed by Peter:^{76a} "After the death of the late Archbishop and Patriarch of the City of Constantinople, John of holy memory, God, who had founded this holy Church on the rock of true incorruptible faith, and decreed that the gates of hell should not prevail against it, gave us a holy shepherd and Patriarch – Epiphanius." At the end of the report the bishops recommended themselves to the fatherly love of "his apostolate – the Pope," and mentioned the legates of the "apostolic see." The apostolic character of the Roman see was acknowledged, too, in letters sent to Hormisda by Pompey,⁷⁷ a relative of the Emperor Anastasius, by Pompey's wife Anastasia⁷⁸ and by his relative Juliana Anicia,⁷⁹ by the Empress

⁷⁵ PL, *ibid.*, cols. 498B, 499A; Col. Avel., *Epist.* 233, pp. 708, 6, 710, 11; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 949, chap. 2, 950, chap. 4: *Nam dum una utraque sit ecclesia, procul dubio et bona, quae per vigilantiam eveniunt, communis exinde laudis gloria utrisque patriarchalibus sedibus rimatur, ut . . . Christus . . . magnificetur.*

⁷⁶ PL, *ibid.*, cols. 483 seq.; Col. Avel., *Epist.* 234, pp. 710, 711, 5, 712, 8, 713, ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 131, pp. 951, chap. 2, 952, chaps. 2, 3.

^{76a} Cf. F. Dvornik, *The Photian Schism, History and Legend* (Cambridge, 1948), p. 165, footnote 4, on this interpretation in the East and in the West in the ninth century.

⁷⁷ PL, *ibid.*, col. 451; Col. Avel., *Epist.* 163, p. 614; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 69, p. 864: *apostolico patri.*

⁷⁸ PL, *ibid.*, cols. 451 seq.; Col. Avel., *Epist.* 165, p. 616; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 70, p. 865: *Patri patrum archiepiscopo universali ecclesiae . . . apostolatus vester, . . . apostolico honore suscipiende pater . . .*

⁷⁹ PL, *ibid.*, col. 451; Col. Avel., *Epist.* 164, p. 615; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 71, p. 866: *principalis sedis apostolicae*; PL, *ibid.*, col. 488; Col. Avel., *Epist.* 198, pp. 657 seq.; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 119, p. 920: *apostolicae sedis probatissimo*

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

Euphemia,⁸⁰ by the nobleman Celer,⁸¹ and by Bishops Theodorus of Lignidum,⁸² Andrew of Praevalis,⁸³ and Dorotheus of Thessalonica.⁸⁴

From all of this evidence it is reasonable to conclude that the long negotiations between East and West, conducted during the Acacian schism, had contributed considerably to the popularization of the idea of apostolicity in the East. The apostolic and Petrine character of the Roman see was generally recognized by the Eastern Church, and the signing of the *Libellus* by the Patriarch of Constantinople and the Eastern bishops sealed the victory not only of orthodoxy, but also of the idea of apostolicity.

On the other hand, however, the Petrine idea, as conceived by Leo the Great and accepted by Gelasius and Symmachus, did not achieve the same success; Alexandria remained a monophysite stronghold, despite some orthodox growth in Egypt, and Antioch, too, was for the greater part lost to orthodoxy.

The situation would have been different if orthodoxy had been as firmly restored in the two major sees of the East as it was in Constantinople. Actually there were indications that Alexandria would have sided with Rome against Constantinople in the struggle over the recognition of the so-called canon twenty-eight of Chalcedon. The attitude of Timothy Aelurus on this point has been reported. Another document indicates that similar sentiments existed in Alexandria in 497. This is the document that the legates of the see of Alexandria handed, in Constantinople, to the papal legates who

pontifici . . . Venerabilis pater, quod de nostrae fidei integritate curam geris, vicariis gloriosi Petri apostoli ista conveniunt, cui dominus pascendarum ovium iniunxit officium . . . tuus apostolatus . . .

⁸⁰ *PL*, *ibid.*, col. 487; *Col. Avel.*, *Epist.* 194, p. 652; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 117, p. 919: *apostolicae sedis auctoritas . . .*

⁸¹ *PL*, *ibid.*, col. 487; *Col. Avel.*, *Epist.* 197, p. 657; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 118, p. 919: *apostolico patri . . . ad apostolatum vestrum . . .*

⁸² *PL*, *ibid.*, col. 452; *Col. Avel.*, *Epist.* 166, p. 617; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 62, p. 854: *adorando apostolico patri . . . ad vestrum pium et sanctum apostolatum . . . vestro offerens apostolatu . . .*

⁸³ *PL*, *ibid.*, col. 443; *Col. Avel.*, *Epist.* 215, pp. 673 seq.; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 63, pp. 855 seq: *beatissimo et apostolica sede intima veneratione praeferendo atque angelicis meritis coaequando patri patrum . . . servi sedis apostolicae . . .*

⁸⁴ *PL*, *ibid.*, col. 500A,B; *Col. Avel.*, *Epist.* 208, p. 668, 4, 5; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 128, p. 940. On the ambiguous attitude of Dorotheus and the difficulties which the Roman legate encountered in Thessalonica see Caspar, *op. cit.*, pp. 165 seq.

APOSTOLICITY DURING THE ACACIAN SCHISM

had been sent by Pope Anastasius II to negotiate with the Emperor Anastasius for the termination of the schism, and it contains an interesting declaration which stresses the intimate ties between Alexandria and Rome. The letter began as follows:⁸⁵

"The venerable holy Churches of the cities of Rome and Alexandria have always preserved concord, not only in the true and immaculate faith from the time the word of salvation was preached in them, but also in divine ministry. That is to say in both of them the foundation of faith was laid by the same man – we mean the blessed Apostle Peter, whose imitator in everything was the holy Evangelist Mark – so that, whenever it happened that in times of uncertainty some councils of bishops were due to be held, the most holy [man] who presided over the Church of Rome used to delegate the most reverend archbishop of the city of Alexandria to take his place."

Here is another allusion to the tie between Rome and Alexandria through St. Peter.⁸⁶ Moreover, the Roman see was mentioned throughout with great reverence, and often called apostolic.⁸⁷ Roman primacy was at least alluded to at the end of the document when the legates asked that the Pope⁸⁸ "may regard also our peoples as his, and may address to them his directives."

In spite of these favorable dispositions, Rome could make no alliance with Alexandria because the Egyptians persevered in their heretical beliefs.^{88a} The profession of faith added to this document was nothing more than that contained in the *Henoticon*.

⁸⁵ Mansi, 8, col. 194; *Col. Avel., Epist.* 102, pp. 468–473; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 5, pp. 628–633.

⁸⁶ *Col. Avel., ibid.*, p. 469, 6; ed. Thiel, *ibid.*, p. 629, chap. 3: *Verumtamen eius volentes satisfacere sanctitati nos eam fidem tenere, quam princeps apostolorum Petrus eiusque discipulus Marcus beatissimi tradiderunt.* . . .

⁸⁷ *Col. Avel., ibid.*, pp. 469, 3, 471, 10, 472, 13, 473, 14; ed. Thiel, *ibid.*, pp. 629, chap. 2, 631, chap. 6, 633, chaps. 7, 8.

⁸⁸ *Col. Avel., ibid.*, p. 473, 16; ed. Thiel, *ibid.*, p. 633, chap. 9: *Confidimus autem in Domino nostro Jesu Christo, quod huic fidei eius beatitudo consentiens juxta illa, quae in responsione sunt posita, veluti proprios etiam nostros populos arbitretur, et pro eorum regimine sollicitudinem gerat.* . . . Cf. Caspar, *op. cit.*, pp. 86 seq.

^{88a} The learned defender of monophysitism in this century, John Philoponus of Alexandria, writing against the Council of Chalcedon, gives vent to his very radical opposition to the principle of apostolicity on which Rome was basing its primacy. The work is lost, but Michael the Syrian has pre-

APOSTOLICITY IN BYZANTIUM

The negotiations for peace were held with the see of Constantinople which was recognized, *de facto*, by Rome as a major see in spite of all that had happened under Leo the Great, Gelasius, and Symmachus. It could not have been otherwise, for even papal opposition could not have stopped the march of history.

In the letter of the Patriarch John II one passage seems to indicate that Constantinople had also attempted to obtain, surreptitiously, a recognition *de jure* of canon three of 381, and of canon twenty-eight of Chalcedon. In his preface to the *Libellus*, which he signed, John II inserted the words:⁸⁹ *Omnibus actis a sanctis istis quattuor synodis, id est Nicaeae, Constantinopoli est Ephesi et Chalcedone, de confirmatione fidei et statu ecclesiae adsentio. . . .*

This passage seems to indicate that John II had also in mind the changes in Church administration, made at the Councils of Constantinople and Chalcedon, in favor of the see of the Imperial City.

served in his Chronicle some long extracts from it, in Syriac translation. In commenting on the instruction given to the legate Paschasinus by Pope Leon I, Philoponus says, with great emphasis (*Chronique de Michel le Syrien*, translated by J. B. Chabot, 2, bk. 8 [Paris, 1901], chap. 13, pp. 101 seq.): "Paschasinus [représentant] de Léon dit: 'Nous avons ordre de l'archevêque Léon, que Dioscorus ne siège pas dans l'assemblée, mais qu'il soit chassé, . . . ' Quel canon ecclésiastique, quelle loi impériale a donné à l'évêque de Rome une puissance qu'il puisse faire ce qu'il veut, promulguer légitimement un décret en dehors du synode, agir illégalement, et alors même que personne n'est d'accord avec lui, faire ce qui lui plaît? Cela est le propre des seuls tyrans.—S'ils mettent en avant l'autorité apostolique de Pierre, et s'ils croient que le clefs du ciel leur ont été données: qu'ils considèrent les autres villes qui sont ornées de l'auréole apostolique. Je passe sous silence la nôtre qui dirige le siège de l'évangéliste Marcus; mais celle des Ephésiens, instituée par l'apôtre Jean, est dirigée par un autre, par celui de Constantinople, parce que le siège de l'empire fut transféré là.—Quoi donc! Si l'évêque de Rome est convaincu de penser mal, à cause de ce trône apostolique, on changera la foi de tout le monde? Pourquoi ceux d'Antioche la grande ne revendiquent-ils pas pour eux la préséance: premièrement parce que Pierre, sur qui les Romains appuient leur grande prétention, y a tout d'abord exercé l'autorité; ensuite parce que là le nom honorable de chrétiens obtint droit de cité? Pourquoi pas celui de Jérusalem? Parce que lui seul eut l'autorité dans la ville impériale, il obtint la préséance sur tous les autres, par un certain usage, à cause de la grandeur de la ville et de l'autorité impériale. Mais aucun canon ecclésiastique n'a institué, aucune loi impériale n'a établi l'évêque de Rome autocrate de tout le monde." This is, of course, the voice of a heretic, and it is difficult to say to what extent Philoponus was able to influence the orthodox who defended Leo's condemnation of monophysism. Photius, in his *Bibliotheca* (PG, 103, col. 97), devotes a very short remark to Philoponus' work, with which he was apparently not favorably impressed.

⁸⁹ *PL, ibid.*, col. 44A: *Col. Avel., Epist.* 159, p. 608, 2; ed Thiel, *Epist.* 61, pp. 852 seq., chap. 1.

APOSTOLICITY DURING THE ACACIAN SCHISM

It would, however, be an exaggeration to think that the acceptance of those canons by Rome was conditional on the final reconciliation, and that Rome had thereby tacitly agreed to it.⁹⁰ It has already been pointed out that canon twenty-eight did not appear until much later in the collection of Byzantine canon law,⁹¹ and nothing in Hormisda's answer to John's letter indicates that the Pope was aware of having made such a concession.⁹²

In fact, however, the see of Rome was obliged to treat the see of Constantinople as a major see. John II's attempts⁹³ to put both sees on the same level have been noted above, and it would have been quite understandable if some of the clergy of Constantinople had gone even further and had attempted to claim an apostolic character for the see of Byzantium also.

In Justinian's letter sent on June 29, 519 to Hormisda a slight involuntary indication is found as to how this claim could have been made. Therein, for the first time, a faint reflection of the apostolic glory is allowed to fall upon Constantinople. Hormisda is invited by Justinian⁹⁴ to grant his request for the complete pacification of the Church, and thereby to honor the relics of the apostles and their church in the residential city.

⁹⁰ As did Caspar, *op. cit.*, p. 158. J. Haller (*Das Papsttum, Idee und Wirklichkeit*, 1 [Urach and Stuttgart, 1950], p. 536) is justified in criticizing Caspar for this exaggeration.

⁹¹ See *supra* p. 102.

⁹² *PL*, *ibid.*, *Epist.* 45, cols. 455 seq.; *Col. Avel., Epist.*, 169, pp. 624-627; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 80, pp. 879-881.

⁹³ See *supra*, p. 131.

⁹⁴ *PL*, *ibid.*, col. 475D; *Col. Avel., Epist.* 187, p. 645, 5; ed. Thiel, *Epist.* 78, p. 877, chap. 2: *Praesumentes autem de beatitudinis vestrae benivolentia paternam dilectionem nimium petimus, quatenus reliquiis sanctorum apostolorum tam nos quam basilicam eorum hic in domo nostra sub nomine praedictorum venerabilius constructam illustrare et illuminare large dignemini*. . . . In three passages of the same letter Justinian recognized the apostolic character of the Roman see.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE BIRTH OF THE ANDREW TRADITION CONCERNING BYZANTIUM

The transfer of Andrew's relics and its meaning — No trace of the Andrew tradition in Chrysostom's writings — St. Gregory of Nazianzus, Cyril of Jerusalem, Theodoret and Basil of Seleucia on Andrew — Western writers on Andrew, his cult in the West — The Andrew Legend unknown in the sixth century — The see of Constantinople called "apostolic" from the seventh century onward — This usage not originated by the Andrew Legend — The defenders of image-worship promote the idea of apostolicity in Constantinople — The *Narratio* key to the dating of writings containing the Andrew and Stachys Legend? — First codification of the Andrew Legend in Pseudo-Epiphanius' List of Disciples — Origin of List of Apostles and Disciples; dating of Pseudo-Epiphanius' List — Pseudo-Dorotheus' List later than Pseudo-Epiphanius' List and the *Narratio*.

The course of events had made the Byzantines increasingly aware of the importance which the idea of apostolicity was gaining in their relationship with Rome. That the bishopric of Byzantium was not of apostolic foundation must have appeared to many a serious handicap; so it would hardly have been surprising if some Byzantine zealots had tried to surmount it by showing that the bishopric of Byzantium was also founded by an apostle.

It was not very difficult to connect the beginnings of the Church of Byzantium with a disciple of Christ. The relics of one of the most prominent of them—St. Andrew—reposed in the Church of the Holy Apostles, together with the bodies of the holy Evangelist St. Luke, and Paul's disciple St. Timothy. St. Andrew was one of Christ's principal disciples. He was Peter's brother and the first of the apostles to be chosen; it was he who had introduced Peter to Christ, and it was on Peter's name that all Rome's pretensions to primacy in the Church rested.

BIRTH OF THE ANDREW TRADITION

It was on such facts as these that the tradition of Byzantium's apostolic origin was to be based, but it is important to learn when the tradition appeared for the first time, how it developed and how it came to be taken for granted by all Byzantines.

It would appear, at first, that the transfer of the relics believed to be those of the Apostle Andrew, St. Luke, and Timothy, to the Church of the Holy Apostles in the newly-founded city of Constantine was intended to bolster the prestige of the bishops of the residential city, but this was not the case. The transfer of the relics should be attributed not to Constantine, but to his son Constantius,¹ who intended thereby to stress the sublime position of the emperors and the priestly character of the *basileia*.² That such was Constantius' intention, is indicated by Socrates, although he ascribes the construction of the Church of the Holy Apostles and the transfer of the relics to Constantine. In his report on Constantine's death, Socrates says:³ "After this, when Constantius arrived from the East [Constantine's] body was honored with a royal funeral, and was placed in the church named for the apostles, which he [Constantine] had built for this purpose, so that the emperors and priests should not be separated from the relics of the apostles."

The last words cannot be interpreted as meaning that Constantine intended to reserve the church for the burial of both emperors and bishops. They are, rather, the expression of the priestly character with which the Hellenistic theory of kingship adorned the *basileus* and which was finding acceptance among the first Christian political thinkers.⁴

¹ See G. Downey, "The Builder of the Original Church of the Apostles at Constantinople," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 6 (1951), pp. 51-80. Cf. also the reviews of this study by the following scholars: F. Halkin in *Analecta Bollandiana*, 70 (1952), pp. 349-350; R. J. H. Jenkins in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 73 (1953), p. 192; A. E. R. Boak in *Speculum*, 28 (1953), pp. 155-158; N. H. Baynes in *English Historical Review*, 68 (1953), pp. 79-82; J. Goubert in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 19 (Rome, 1953), pp. 234-236, and D. Talbot Rice in *Antiquaries Journal*, 33 (1953), pp. 91 and 92.

² It is the author's intention to study the political ideas of Constantius in his book *Origins of Christian Political Philosophy* (chap. 7), now in preparation. In the present work only some essential remarks are made on this subject.

³ *Historia ecclesiastica*, I, 40; PG, 67, col. 180: Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἐκ τῶν ἀνατολικῶν μερῶν ἐπιστάντος Κωνσταντίου, κηδείας τῆς βασιλικῆς ἡξιοῦτο, ἀποτεθεὶς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ ἐπ' αὐτῶν τῶν Ἀποστόλων, ἣν δι' αὐτὸ τοῦτο πεποιθήκει, ὥπως ἂν οἱ βασιλεῖς τε καὶ ἱερεῖς τῶν ἀποστολικῶν λειψάνων μὴ ἀπολιμπάνοιντο.

⁴ See F. Dvornik "Emperors, Popes and General Councils," in *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 6 (1951), pp. 16-22.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

The testimony of St. John Chrysostom, who occupied the see of Constantinople from 398 to 404, can also be adduced as a clear indication that the church of the Holy Apostles was regarded only as a burial place of the emperors. In one of his homilies⁵ he exclaims: "In the most imperial city, Rome, emperors and consuls and generals cast all else aside and ran to the tombs of the fisherman and the tentmaker [Peter and Paul], and in Constantinople those who wear the diadem consider it a source of satisfaction to have their bodies buried not close to the apostles, but outside, alongside the vestibule, and so the emperors have become the doorkeepers of the fishermen, and in their death they are not dishonored but are rendered proud, not themselves alone, but their children as well."

This idea is even more clearly expressed by Chrysostom in another homily:⁶ "For there, too [in Constantinople], his son [Constantius] considered that he was honoring Constantine the Great with a great honor if he laid him in the vestibule of the fisherman; and what the gatekeepers of palaces are to the sovereign, the emperors are to the fishermen in their place of burial. For the latter [the apostles] are the masters who dwell within the place, and the former [the emperors], like neighbors living nearby, are happy to have the gate of the courtyard entrusted to their care, so that from these places they may show unbelievers that at the time of resurrection the fishermen enjoy greater prominence."

The fact that the relics of St. Andrew, St. Luke, and St. Timothy were brought to Constantinople in order to increase the prestige of the *basileia* in the eyes of the Byzantines did not encourage them to associate these apostolic relics with the bishops of the capital, and this must have retarded the growth of the apostolic idea in Constantinople. Actually, it is surprising to note that, in the two centuries that followed the foundation of Constantinople, very little attention was paid to St. Andrew, and no attempt was made to connect with the bishopric of Byzantium the belief that his relics reposed in the residential city.

⁵ *Homilia contra Judaeos et Gentiles*, 9, PG, 48, col. 825.

⁶ *Homilia in Epist. 2 ad Corinth.* 26, 53, PG, 61, col. 582.

BIRTH OF THE ANDREW TRADITION

It is again St. John Chrysostom who supplies the most valuable information in this respect. Of course, in his numerous homilies and other writings, he had often to speak of the apostles. However, it is not Andrew who enjoys his full attention, but Andrew's brother Peter. Sometimes in Chrysostom's works praise of Peter may be found such as not even one of Chrysostom's contemporary western ecclesiastical writers could surpass. Peter is called, in addition to the coryphaeus of the apostles,⁷ an "immovable foundation, the rock which cannot be broken, the Prince of the Church, the unassailable haven, the unshaken tower . . . , the column of the Churches, the haven of faith, and the doctor of the universe."

To these glorious epithets, Chrysostom adds other significant titles. Peter was "the mouthpiece of the disciples, column of the Church, basis of the faith, foundation of the confession, the fisherman of the whole world, who brought our race from the depth of error into heaven . . . , always mindful of the salvation of others."⁸ The love of Christ of this "prefect of the universe" is highly praised,⁹ his firmness, meekness, and zeal are stressed,¹⁰ the virtue of his miracles is said to have converted the whole earth,¹¹ and he is the rock on which Christ would build his Church.¹² Paul, too, earns highest praise, but it is always stressed that he regarded himself inferior to Peter.¹³

Chrysostom, of course, speaks also of Andrew, and in one of his homilies is found a short passage which can be interpreted as an allusion to Andrew as a teacher of Byzantium. Scandalized by the fact that many people preferred on Fridays to go to the hippodrome

⁷ *Homilia in Petrum Apost. et in Heliam prophetam*, PG, 50, cols. 727 seq. The epithet *coryphaeus* or "Prince of the Apostles" is given to Peter almost every time Chrysostom speaks of him.

⁸ *Homilia De Decem millium talent. debitore*, PG, 51, col. 20.

⁹ *Homilia In illud, hoc scitote quod in novissimis diebus* (II Tim. 3:1), PG, 56, col. 275.

¹⁰ *In Matthaeum Hom.* 50(51), PG, 58, col. 535 (Peter again called coryphaeus of all apostles). *In Acta Apost. Hom.* 4, PG, 60, cols. 63 seq.; *Hom.* 8, *ibid.*, col. 88. *In Joan. Hom.* 73(74), PG, 59, cols. 395 seq.

¹¹ *In Matth. Hom.* 56(57), PG, 58, cols. 550 seq.

¹² *In Matth. Hom.* 46(47), *ibid.*, 58, col. 535, particularly clearly in *Hom.* 19(18) in *Joan.*, PG, 59, col. 122. These are only a few quotations of the numerous references to Peter in Chrysostom's works.

¹³ Particularly in *Hom. In illud, in faciem ei restiti*, PG, 51, col. 378, and *Hom.* 3 in *Epist. 1 ad Cor.*, PG, 61, col. 24.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

or to the theater rather than to church, Chrysostom exclaims:¹⁴ "Is this the city of the apostles, the same which possesses such an interpreter?" He evidently has in mind not only the church of the Holy Apostles in Constantinople, but also the relics of St. Andrew, Luke, and Timothy which reposed there. In this connection the interpreter whom Chrysostom mentions could be Andrew, and B. de Montfaucon, the first editor of the homily, which was reprinted by Migne with his commentary, explained the passage as referring to the Andrew tradition—namely, that this Apostle had preached in Byzantium. On the other hand, it has been suggested that Chrysostom had in mind the relics revered as those of the prophet Samuel, which were transported by the Emperor Arcadius from Judaea to Constantinople.¹⁵ St. Jerome¹⁶ describes this transfer in glowing terms and, judging from his description, the ceremony must have left a great impression on the faithful of the capital. It would seem quite natural, therefore, for Chrysostom to have made an allusion to the presence in the city of the relics of such a great prophet.

There is, however, some difficulty concerning the dating of this transfer. Jerome simply attributes the initiative for it to the Emperor Arcadius, who reigned from 395 to 408, without indicating the exact date. Theodore the Lector¹⁷ and the *Chronicon Paschale*,¹⁸ however, add that it occurred when Atticus was Patriarch (that is, from 405 or 406 to 425). The *Chronicon* dates the transfer in the year 406, and since the dating of the *Chronicon* is generally reliable, there is no reason to reject it in this instance and to place the transfer in the year 397. Thus it is evident that Chrysostom could not have had the relics of the Prophet Samuel in mind.

Neither, however, can the interpretation of Montfaucon be accep-

¹⁴ *Hom. contra ludos et theatra* 1, PG, 56, col. 264: ταῦτα ἡ πόλις τῶν ἀποστόλων; ταῦτα ἡ τοιοῦτον λαβοῦσα ὑποφήτην; the homily was pronounced on Sunday, July 3, 399. See for details P. Batiffol, "De quelques homélies de S. Jean Chrysostome et de la version gothique des écritures," in *Revue biblique*, 8 (1899), p. 567, and especially J. Pargoire, "Les homélies de S. Jean Chrysostome en Juillet 399," in *Echos d'Orient*, 3 (1899-1900), pp. 151-155.

¹⁵ Such is the opinion of J. Ch. Baur, *Der heilige Johannes Chrysostomus und seine Zeit*, 2 (Munich, 1930), p. 77.

¹⁶ *Contra Vigilantium*, 5, PL, 23, col. 358.

¹⁷ *Hist. eccles.* 2, 63; PG, 86, col. 213.

¹⁸ Ed. Bonn, ad an. 406, p. 569.

BIRTH OF THE ANDREW TRADITION

ted. It seems evident that the panegyrist makes an allusion here to Andrew, but the words do not mean that Andrew had preached in Byzantium. Strictly interpreted, Chrysostom's words point to his own time, and indicate that he had in mind only the relics of Andrew, the great interpreter of Christ's words, which had been received by the city and were then in its possession. It cannot therefore be concluded from this passage that Chrysostom knew of the tradition concerning Andrew's preaching in Byzantium.

It is rather significant that neither in this homily nor elsewhere does Chrysostom give special prominence to Andrew. In another passage in the same homily Chrysostom recalls¹⁹ how, a short time before, when torrential rain had threatened to ruin the crops, "the whole of the populace of our city in a mighty surge hastened toward the place of the apostles. We implored our defenders, Saint Peter and Blessed Andrew, and this apostolic pair, Paul and Timothy. And after that, when the tempest had subsided, we courageously crossed the sea and the waves and we hastened to the coryphaeus, Peter, the foundation of the faith, and Paul, the vessel of election, celebrating a spiritual feast. . . ."²⁰

That the Apostle Andrew is not given a more prominent place in these supplications is somewhat surprising. The relics of Peter and Paul were not in Constantinople; nevertheless both Apostles were mentioned and given prominence before Andrew. Perhaps the fact that Chrysostom came from Antioch, whose Christianization was intimately connected with Peter, influenced him.

Even on other occasions Chrysostom has little to say of Peter's brother. When speaking of him in his homily on Matthew's Gospel, he makes the point that Andrew was the first of the apostles to be invited by Christ to join him, but, having done this, he devotes all his attention to Peter, dwelling on the Lord's words with which Peter was greeted when introduced by his brother.²¹ When naming the apostles, Chrysostom emphatically places Andrew after Peter, although before all other apostles of course, but that is his only

¹⁹ PG, 56, col. 265.

²⁰ For more details on this pilgrimage see Pargoire, *op. cit.*, pp. 156 seq.

²¹ In *Matth. Hom.* 14, PG. 57, cols. 218 seq.; In *Joan. Hom.* 19(18), PG, 59, cols. 120 seq.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

reference to him here.²² In another instance²³ he counts Andrew among the four coryphaei of the apostles, naming Peter, Andrew, James, and John.

It is significant that when speaking of some deed or virtues of the apostles he does not cite Andrew as an example, but only Peter, James, and John,²⁴ and his evaluation of the fact that the relics of an apostle repose in a church in Constantinople is also interesting. He does not ignore the fact, but in one of his homilies²⁵ apostrophizes his listeners as follows: "We came to the tombs of the apostles. We can see their wounds and stigmata, their blood flowing more precious than gold, the chains, the cudgels, their daily death which they had suffered for the Church. Paul's disciple who travelled everywhere with him, who is equal to his master, a heifer in the same yoke with the bull; the brother of the first of the apostles, a fisherman, who had spread out the net, and instead of catching fishes, was claiming men; and the messenger of the Gospel—and let us consider with pleasure their famous deeds. . . ."

The homilist was evidently pointing to the relics of Timothy, Andrew, and Luke, but it is surprising that he placed Timothy—for whom he seems to have had a special predilection²⁶—before Andrew, although Peter's brother should have taken precedence over Paul's disciple.

This is not the only instance of Chrysostom's relegating Andrew's relics somewhat to the background. When Chrysostom returned from his first exile he was apparently greeted in the church of the Holy Apostles where he is said to have addressed his faithful extemporaneously. Pointing to the relics deposited in the church, he exclaimed:²⁷ "Therefore I called you to come to the Holy

²² *In Matth. Hom.* 32(33), *ibid.*, 57, col. 380.

²³ *In Matth. Hom.* 37(38), *ibid.*, col. 424: Philip and the two pairs of the coryphaei.

²⁴ *Ad eas qui scandalizati sunt liber unus*, PG, 52, cols. 512 seq. *In Matth. Hom.* 46(47), *ibid.*, 58, cols. 479 seq.: *In Matth. Hom.* 65(64), *ibid.*, cols. 621 seq. Andrew is mentioned only in *Hom. 3 in Acta Apost.*, PG., 60, cols. 33 seq., as staying in Jerusalem with Peter after Christ's resurrection. Moreover, in one spurious homily Andrew is said to have preached in Greece: *Hom. in 12 Apost.*, PG, 59, col. 495.

²⁵ *Hom. 10, in illud, messis quidem multa*, PG, 63, col. 518.

²⁶ Cf. Chrysostom's homilies on Paul's letters to Timothy, PG, 62, cols. 503-700.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 52, col. 440.

BIRTH OF THE ANDREW TRADITION

Apostles. We, the exiled, came to them who were exiled. We were assailed with intrigues, they were banned. We came to Timothy, the new Paul. We came to the holy bodies which had carried Christ's stigmata." There is no mention of Andrew in this short speech. The second version of Chrysostom's address contains the following:²⁸ "Therefore I invited you to the church of the Holy Apostles in order to come to them who once had suffered persecution. We have been subjected to intrigue, they have been attacked. But the enemies did no damage to them because they have conquered the whole world. Let us go to Timothy, the new Paul, and to Andrew, the other Peter. We believe that we are supported by their merits." Timothy is again given precedence, although Andrew is mentioned as a second Peter.

To evaluate this indifference to Andrew's relics in Constantinople, we should read Chrysostom's enthusiastic eulogies addressed to Rome because it was the burial place of Peter and Paul.²⁹ "Heaven, when the sun is emitting its rays is not as resplendent as the city of the Romans radiating everywhere in the universe the light of these two lamps. From there Paul will be taken away, and from there Peter also. Consider and be amazed, what a spectacle Rome will witness when Paul and Peter shall suddenly be resurrected from that tomb and be lifted up to meet Christ. What a gift will Rome present to Christ, with what two crowns is it adorned! With what golden chains is it girded, what fountains it possesses! I admire this city, not because of its multitude of gold, not because of its columns, not because of its pomp, but because of these two pillars of the Church." One can detect here a kind of nostalgic envy of Rome's possession of such treasures, but it does not occur to Chrysostom to point out that his city, too, can boast apostles' tombs. Rome was still the venerated source of Roman glory, the first capital of the Empire, and Peter and Paul were the heroes of whom the whole Church and Empire were proud.

In one homily on the epistle to the Hebrews³⁰ there is a passage which deserves special quotation. After praising Joseph, who,

²⁸ *Ibid.*, col. 442.

²⁹ *Hom.* 36, *Encomium in S. Apost. Paulum*, PG, 63, cols. 846 seq.

³⁰ *Hom.* 26, PG, 63, col. 179.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

although living in Egypt, had never lost faith in the Lord's promises to Abraham, and had ordered that his remains be returned finally to the land of promise (Exodus 13:19), Chrysostom goes on: "What! tell me, do not even Moses' bones repose in a foreign country? We do not know where the remains of Aaron, Daniel, Jeremiah, and many of the apostles are resting. The tombs of Peter, Paul, John, and Thomas³¹ are known; [the tombs] of the others who are so many have never become known. But let us not be sad or downhearted, because wherever we may be buried, 'the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof'" (Psalms 23:1, 24:1).

This is puzzling. Strictly interpreted, these words would mean that Chrysostom had some doubts as to the authenticity of the relics, supposedly Andrew's, that reposed in the church of the Holy Apostles, for he said rather emphatically that he knew the location of the tombs of only Peter, Paul, John, and Thomas. In any case, the passage shows clearly that in Chrysostom's time little attention was paid to the fact that Constantinople was in possession of apostolic relics, and that no connection had yet been made between the foundation of Byzantine Christianity and St. Andrew.

John Chrysostom was the first of the Greek writers to devote particular attention to St. Andrew and his relics. Gregory of Nazianzus, who occupied the see of Constantinople from 379 to 381, referred to Andrew only very briefly³² in his catalogue of apostles, mentioning Greece as his missionary field. Cyril of Jerusalem (362-373) mentioned the twelve apostles in general, and wherever he singled out any of them he named only Peter, Paul, John, Thomas, and Philip.³³ He mentioned Andrew only once in his seventeenth

³¹ The relics of St. Thomas, who seems to have died near Malaipur in South India, were transported, during the third century, to Edessa. Cf. R. A. Lipsius, *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden*, 1, pt. 1 (Brunswick, 1883-1890), p. 226 seq., 2, pt. 2, pp. 418 seq.

³² *Oratio 33 contra Arianos et de se ipso*, PG, 36, col. 228. In one of his Songs he gives the names of the twelve apostles, with Andrew (*Carminum. lib. 1, Poemata dogmatica, cant. 19*, PG, 37, col. 488), and he mentions briefly in another one (*Carm. lib. 2, Historica, Poemata de se ipso 4, vers. 59, ibid., col. 1258*) the church of the Holy Apostles in Constantinople. Cf. also *Oratio 42* (PG, 36, col. 489). In *Oratio 4* (PG, 35, col. 589B) he mentions Andrew too among the Christian heroes whose feast days are celebrated.

³³ *Catechesis 14*, PG, 33, col. 853, *Catech. 17, ibid., col. 996 seq.*

BIRTH OF THE ANDREW TRADITION

Catechesis,³⁴ when he commented on the apostles' speaking various languages on the day of Pentecost, and in this connection he ventured the guess that Peter and Andrew, both of whom were Galileans, probably conversed in Persian or Medic.^{34a}

Proclus, who occupied the see of Constantinople from 434 to 447, devoted a short homily to St. Andrew,³⁵ but the panegyric is written in very general terms, extolling the sublimity of the apostles' vocation, and the merits of their activity. Only in the last part of his sermon did the Patriarch describe how Andrew responded to the invitation of the Lord to join him. Andrew hastened to bring this news to his older brother, Peter. "We have found the Messiah," the panegyrist has Andrew exclaim, and then, forgetting his hero, he addresses Peter, exhorting him to leave his occupation, his country, Jerusalem, and the temple, and to follow Christ. Nothing in the homily suggests any connection between Andrew and the see of Byzantium, and there is no indication that the Patriarch intended to exalt Andrew because of Peter. On the contrary, Peter occupies a more prominent place than Andrew.

It should be noted also that the apostolic idea found no recognition in the correspondence of Proclus with Antioch. Proclus gave the city only the usual epithet, "the great city,"³⁶ although he must have known that the Antiochenes were well aware of the apostolic origin of their see. In a letter addressed to Proclus the synod of Antioch, convoked by Bishop John, recalled the apostolic origin of the see when enumerating the Fathers whose doctrine confirmed its teaching. The name of the great martyr Ignatius, who came "second after Peter the first of the apostles and organized the Church of the see of Antioch," starts the series of Fathers.³⁷

³⁴ *Ibid.*, col. 988.

^{34a} According to the *Chronicon Paschale* (Bonn), p. 566, Arcadia, daughter of the Emperor Arcadius (395-405), constructed a church in honor of St. Andrew, which shows that the cult of the Apostle was then alive in Byzantium.

³⁵ *PG*, 65, cols. 821-828.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, col. 881D: τῶν Ἀντιοχείων μεγαλόπολεως ἡ πόλις. Cf. what E. Caspar (*Geschichte der Papsttums*, I, p. 583) says on the origin of this title: "Großkirche scheint geradezu eine früheste eigene Bezeichnung für die Weltkirchen Rom, Alexandria und Antioch gewesen zu sein."

³⁷ *PG*, 65, col. 878.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

Proclus' contemporary, Theodoret, also knew of the Antiochene tradition, and he termed apostolic not only the see of Antioch,³⁸ but also that of Alexandria.³⁹ The apostolic tradition concerning Antioch and Alexandria is most clearly expressed by Theodoret in his letter to Flavian of Constantinople. Complaining about Dioscorus of Alexandria, Theodoret says:⁴⁰ "He will not obey the holy canons, but is exalting the throne of the blessed Mark although he well knows that the great city of the Antiochenes is in possession of the see of the great Peter, who was also the teacher of blessed Mark, and the first and coryphaeus of the apostles."

With regard to Andrew, Theodoret mentioned him only when speaking of the lands where the apostles had preached. He also assigned Greece to Andrew.⁴¹

There exists another homily on St. Andrew which was once ascribed to St. Athanasius,⁴² but which was actually written in the fifth century. Its author is Basil, Metropolitan of Seleucia, who died about the year 459.⁴³ No trace of tendentious exaltation of Andrew is found in this short oration on Peter. On the contrary, Peter is recognized as the first of the apostles, although Andrew was the first who was called by the Lord. Andrew is said to have preached in Greece and to have suffered martyrdom in Achaëa. The homilist seems not at all inclined to bring Andrew into closer connection with Byzantium. Evidently the importance of the claim to apostolicity was not yet felt in Constantinople. The privileged position of the city as the imperial residence was still regarded as sufficient reason for assuring to the patriarch of Constantinople a prominent rank in the Church.

³⁸ *Hist. eccles.*, 3, 14; *PG*, 82, col. 1109; *GCS*, 19, ed. L. Parmentier, bk. 3, chap. 17, p. 197. Letter 112 to Domnus of Antioch, *PG*, 83, col. 1309.

³⁹ Letter 83 to Dioscorus of Alexandria, *PG*, 83, col. 1272. In his letter to Pope Leo, Theodoret also calls the Roman see "apostolic." *PG*, *ibid.*, cols. 1313A, 1316D.

⁴⁰ *PG*, 83, col. 1280C (Letter 86). On two occasions Theodoret mentions the relics of the apostles, but only in very general terms, without specifying whose relics he had in mind. In *Psalm*. 46, *PG*, 80, col. 1208C, and in *Psalm*. 67, *ibid.*, col. 1381C.

⁴¹ Interpretation in *Psalm*. 116, *PG*, 80, cols. 1805 seq.

⁴² *PG*, 28, cols. 1101-1113. *Cf. infra*. p. 217.

⁴³ This has been shown by B. Marx in his study "Der homiletische Nachlass des Basileios von Seleukia," in *OCP*, 7 (1941), pp. 329-369 (on the homily, pp. 350-352).

BIRTH OF THE ANDREW TRADITION

There exists also a document of Latin and Western origin which makes it evident that the Andrew Legend was not yet known at the beginning of the fifth century. It is a Latin poem composed by Paulinus, who was born probably in 353 in or near Bordeaux, and who became Bishop of Nola about 409 and died in 431.

In one of his poems Paulinus glorifies the city of Constantinople, comparing it to Rome.⁴⁴ He states first that Constantine, when he founded his city and started to build its walls, was invited by God, not only to imitate the city of Romulus by the building of walls, but also to strengthen them with the bodies of apostles. So Constantine brought Andrew from Greece and Timothy from Asia. "Thus," Paulinus continues, "Constantinople stands with twin towers of strength, a rival of great Rome, and more truly like the Roman walls in this honor, because God, in an effort to make the honor equal, gave the like of Peter and Paul to the city which was worthy of taking to itself the disciple of Paul and the brother of Peter."

Paulinus must have been a great admirer of the Apostle Andrew and of Luke, for he congratulates himself on having obtained part of their relics for his basilicas in Nola and Fondi,⁴⁵ and he mentions them on two other occasions in his poems.⁴⁶

His attitude as shown in his poems confirms, in the first place, that the transfer of the relics of St. Andrew to Constantinople was in no way regarded in the West and in Rome as an act of rivalry with the old Imperial City which possessed the relics of St. Peter and St. Paul, and, in the second place, that his way of referring to the relics of St. Andrew was an indication that in the West the legend of the foundation of the see of Constantinople by Andrew was still unknown at the beginning of the fifth century. Finally, the comparison between Timothy and Paul, and between Andrew and Peter, brought out by Paulinus, reveals that a compromise between the principle of apostolicity and that of adaptation to the changes of political organization was possible in this period, and it is the

⁴⁴ Paulinus Nolensis, *Carmen* 19, vss. 329-342, *CSEL*, 30, ed. G.Hartel, pp. 129, 130.

⁴⁵ *Epist.* 32, *ibid.*, 29, p. 292, *Carmen* 27, vss. 406, 424, *ibid.*, 30, pp. 280, 281.

⁴⁶ *Carmen* 19, vss. 73-83, 336 (Andrew and Timothy) *ibid.*, 30, pp. 121, 130. *Epist.* 29, chap. 7, *ibid.*, 29, p. 252 (Luke).

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

more regrettable that the Eastern Fathers in Chalcedon failed to see this possibility, and displayed less comprehension of the Roman principle of apostolicity than did a Latin writer of their principle of adaptation to political organization.

Gaudentius of Brescia, who died about 410, also testifies to the fact that the Apostle Andrew was greatly venerated in the Western Church in his day. In his sermon on the day of dedication of a *Concilium Sanctorum*⁴⁷—a church that contained all the holy relics of which Brescia could boast—the Bishop proudly points out that the most precious relics in the Church are those of St. John the Baptist, the Apostles Andrew and Thomas, and the Evangelist Luke. He does not mention the last burial place of St. Andrew and Luke in Constantinople. He says only that they are believed to have suffered martyrdom in Patras in Achaëa. In any case, Gaudentius seems to have known nothing of the Andrew Legend's connection with the see of Byzantium. He apparently obtained the relics of the Apostles from St. Ambrose who must have received them as a gift from Constantinople.

Brescia was neither the first nor the only Italian city that could boast possession of relics of St. Andrew at that early period. St. Ambrose constructed in Milan a church dedicated to the Holy Apostles and deposited there some relics of the Apostles Andrew,^{47a} John, and Thomas. According to the *Martyrium Hieronymianum*, the deposition was commemorated yearly in that city on the ninth of May. The same source marks, too, the anniversary on September third of the dedication of a basilica in Aquileia to SS. Andrew, Luke, and John.^{47b} S. Victricius, Bishop of Rouen who died at the be-

⁴⁷ Sermo 17 (*De diversis capitulis septimus*), PL, 20 cols. 961 seq. *Post hunc [Joannem Baptistam] habemus Andream beatissimum, primum Ioannis ipsius discipulum, deinde Salvatoris, quem priorem Christus apostolum scribitur elegisse Horum quatuor beatas habemus in praesenti reliquias, qui regnum Dei, et iustitiam praedicantes, ab incredulis, et iniquis occisi, Deo semper vivere operationum suarum virtutibus demonstrantur. Ioannes in Sebastena urbe provinciae Palaestinae, Thomas apud Indos, Andreas et Lucas apud Patras Achaiae civitatem, consummati referuntur.*

^{47a} F. Savio, *Gli antichi vescovi d'Italia dalle origini al 1300 descritti per regioni*, 1 (Florence, 1913), La Lombardia, Milano, p. 822.

^{47b} *Acta Sanctorum Novembris*, 2, p. 57: *Mediolano. De ingressu reliquiarum apostolorum Ioannis, Andreae et Thomae, in basilica. Ibid.*, p. 115: *In Aquileia. Dedicatio basilicae Andreae apostoli, Lucae, Ioannis, Eufemie et Aristoni.* The city of Concordia in Lombardy also possessed some souvenirs of apostles,

BIRTH OF THE ANDREW TRADITION

ginning of the fifth century, also mentions with satisfaction the deposition in his cathedral of some relics of SS. Thomas, Andrew, and Luke.^{47c}

During the same early period there were in Ravenna also monuments dedicated to St. Andrew. Theodorich constructed a church in the name of the Apostle and dedicated it to the cult of the Goths.^{47d} His contemporary, Bishop Peter II (494–519) erected in his residence a chapel of St. Andrew,^{47e} and Bishop Maximian (d. 546) restored the church of St. Andrew and deposited there the relics brought from Constantinople.^{47f} Maximian must have been in Constantinople soon after 548 when, during the demolition of the old basilica, relics of Sts. Andrew, Luke, and Timothy were rediscovered and placed in the new building constructed by Justinian.^{47g} This is indicated in the report of Agnellus, ninth-century author and Church historian of Ravenna, who, on this occasion, wrote of an imaginary encounter

including those of Andrew. See P. Paschini, "Note sull' origine della chiesa di Concordia," in *Memorie Storiche Forogiuliesi*, 7 (1911), pp. 9–24 (unavailable to the present writer). On St. Andrew's relics at Nola and Fondi see *supra* p. 149. Cf. also H. Delehaye, "Loca Sanctorum," *AnBoll*, 48 (1930), pp. 9–13. A church of the Holy Apostles was built in Lodi also. Ambrose may have given part of the apostolic relics to this church too because he was invited by Bishop Bassianus to consecrate the church. Cf. *S. Ambrosii epistolae, Epist.* 4, 1; *PL*, 16, col. 927. The initiator of this cult of the apostles in northern Italy was St. Ambrose.

^{47c} S. Victorius, *Liber de laude sanctorum*, *PL*, 20, col. 448C.

^{47d} W. Ensslin, *Theodorich der Grosse* (Munich, 1947), pp. 261, 266 (without reference). The church of St. Andrew designated for the Arians was destroyed by the Venetians in 1457. The Goths seem to have had a particular veneration for St. Andrew. His feast is duly commemorated on November 29th in a fifth-century Gothic calendar composed in Thrace. See H. Achelis, "Der älteste deutsche Kalender," in *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1 (1900), pp. 308–335. Cf. *PL*, 18, col. 880. Petrus Chrysologus of Ravenna, who died in 450, commemorated Andrew's feast day in a short sermon in which he said that the Saint was crucified on a tree (*Oratio*, 133, *PL*, 52, cols. 563, 564).

^{47e} See for details, G. Gerola, "Il ripristino della cappella di S. Andrea nel palazzo vescovile di Ravenna," *Felix Ravenna*, N. S., 41 (1932), pp. 71 seq. See Agnellus, *Codex pontificalis ecclesiae Ravennatensis*, ed. A. Testi Rospomini, L. A. Muratori, *Rerum italicarum scriptores*, 2, pt. 3 (new ed., Bologna, 1924), pp. 149, 150. On St. Andrew's relics in Milan, Aquileia, Concordia, and Ravenna cf. also H. Delehaye, *Les origines du culte des martyrs* (2nd ed., Brussels, 1933), pp. 325, 326, 332, 333, 338.

^{47f} Agnellus, *ibid.*, pp. 195, 122.

^{47g} Procopius, *De aedificiis Justiniani* (Bonn), pp. 188 seq., ed. J. Haury (Teubner, 1913), pp. 24 seq.; Malalas, *Chronographia* (Bonn), p. 484; Theophanes, *Chronographia* (Bonn), p. 352.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

between Maximian and Justinian which reveals the intensity of the veneration in which St. Andrew was held throughout Byzantium and the West.

Agnellus reports that Maximian wished to take the body of St. Andrew to Ravenna, but that the Emperor thought it fitting for the New Rome to own the relics of St. Peter's brother, since Old and New Rome were sisters, and Peter and Andrew were brothers. Maximian, however, succeeded, by means of a ruse, in obtaining at least the beard of St. Andrew, which he transported to Ravenna. In closing his fictitious narrative, Agnellus exclaims with an almost-audible sigh, "and believe me, brothers, if the body of the blessed Andrew, the brother of Peter the Princeps, had been buried here [in Ravenna], the Roman pontiffs would never have subjugated us."

Agnellus' words reflect the echo of Ravenna's struggle for ecclesiastical autonomy against the claims of the Roman popes, a struggle that started under Maximian, was continued by Bishop Maurus who in 666 had obtained from the Emperor Constans II^{47h} a decree of autocephaly for Ravenna, and that endured as long as the exarchate of Ravenna existed. The spirit of independence was still alive in the ninth century, as is apparent from Agnellus' words. His remark concerning the relics of St. Andrew reveal in what high esteem the idea of apostolicity was held in the West at that time.⁴⁷ⁱ His comment is particularly significant, for the rediscovery, under Justinian, of St. Andrew's relics does not appear to have very greatly stirred Byzantine ecclesiastical circles of that period.

This is not all. Let us not forget that the Feast of St. Andrew was celebrated in Rome in the fourth century, and was preceded by a vigil with fasting. The *Sacramentarium Leonianum* has a particular Mass formula for the vigil and three other formulas for the Feast of St. Andrew, with special prayers and prefaces. The prefaces of the second and fourth formulas are particularly interesting because they attest to the intimate relationship between Andrew and his

^{47h} F. Dölger, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches*, 1 (Munich, Berlin, 1924), p. 27. L. Duchesne, *Liber Pontificalis*, 1 (Paris, 1886), p. 360.

⁴⁷ⁱ It is doubtful that Justinian ever contemplated the possibility of a transfer of Andrew's relics to Ravenna, as is suggested by. O. G. von Simson, *Sacred Fortress, Byzantine Art and Statecraft in Ravenna* (Chicago, 1948), pp. 17 seq.

BIRTH OF THE ANDREW TRADITION

brother Peter.^{47j} We read in the preface of the second formula: "[Andrew] who was verily a brother of the glorious Apostle Peter, through the fate of birth, through the community of faith, through the dignity of belonging to the apostolic college, and through the glory of martyrdom, so that they whom Your Grace had united during the course of this life with so many bonds of piety are joined in the heavenly kingdom with a similar crown."

The second preface contains a similar passage: "We celebrate the day dedicated to the glorious martyrdom through which the venerable Andrew showed himself a true brother of the blessed Peter, as well in preaching Thy Christ as in confessing him, and at the same time adorned the order of the apostolic dignity with martyrdom and glory, so that they who were struggling for the same cause obtained the same recompense and reward."

The cult of St. Andrew grew in Rome particularly during the Acacian schism. The first basilica in honor of St. Andrew was erected there on the Esquiline by Pope Simplicius (468-483). Gelasius I (492-496) had also constructed, on the Via Labicana, an oratory in honor of St. Andrew. Symachus (498-514) symbolized the intimate relationship between Peter and Andrew when he built a rotunda dedicated to St. Andrew near the basilica of St. Peter.^{47k} It is quite possible that the number of the Mass formulas in honor of St. Andrew corresponded to the number of St. Andrew sanctuaries extant in Rome in the fifth century.

The spread of the cult of St. Andrew in Rome, in Italy, and in Gaul during the fourth and fifth centuries indicates clearly that, contrary to the conviction of some scholars,^{47l} the Westerners were not yet aware of any Byzantine attempt to overshadow or to

^{47j} *PL*, 55, cols. 144-146. Cf. A. I. Schuster, *Liber sacramentorum*, 6 (Milan, 1941), pp. 70-75.

^{47k} See on these churches, L. Duchesne, *op. cit.*, 2, pp. 249, 250, 255, 256, 261, 265. In the writings of Victor, Bishop of Vita, there is some indication that Andrew's cult penetrated into Africa in the fifth century (*De persecutione vandolica*, 5, 20; *PL*, 58, col. 258). In M. Petscheng's critical edition (*CSEL*, 7, p. 106) the passage on Andrew was, however, omitted since it did not conform to the tradition of the manuscripts.

^{47l} For example, B. Kraft, "Andreas," in *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, 1, ed. M. Buchberger (Freiburg i. B., 1930), col. 411; J. Beran, "Hat Gregor der Grosse dem Embolismus der römischen Liturgie den Namen des hl. Andreas beigelegt?", *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, 55 (N. S. 15, 1941), pp. 83 seq.; J. A. Jungmann, *Missarum Sollemnia* (Vienna, 1948), p. 345.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

equalize the prestige of Peter with that of his brother, "the first called." When we take into consideration how slowly the idea of apostolicity progressed in Constantinople, it is no wonder that there was no attempt, up to this period, to connect Andrew with the origins of Christianity in Byzantium.

With time, however, the bishops of the Imperial City must have become increasingly conscious of the disadvantage under which they suffered in their controversies with the apostolic see of St. Peter, and this must have been especially apparent during the Acacian schism (486–519). Its liquidation by Pope Hormisda demonstrated the strength of the Roman argument of apostolicity, and undoubtedly impressed the Byzantines.

In the meantime, two incidents occurred which were potential links between St. Andrew and the bishops of Byzantium. Thanks to a curious intervention of fate, it was John Chrysostom who was chosen, after his death, to modify Constantius' view that only emperors could be buried near the relics of the apostles. Chrysostom was sent into exile by order of Emperor Arcadius, who was influenced in this matter by the Empress Eudoxia, but his relics were brought back to Constantinople from Comana, where he had died in 407, by order of another Emperor, Theodosius II, on 27 January 438.⁴⁸

Theodosius II, Pulcheria, and the Patriarch Proclus made an impressive show of reverence for the relics of the Saint and, in order to atone for the great sin committed by his parents, Theodosius II permitted the interment of the relics in the church of Constantinople that was most venerable after the church of Hagia Sophia—the church of the Holy Apostles. Thus, for the first time, the body of a patriarch of Constantinople was placed near the burial-place of the emperors and the relics of the apostles.

This act became the source of another legend that developed fully at a later period, and that attributed to Constantine the intention of making the church of the Holy Apostles a burial-place for both emperors and patriarchs. First to interpret the use of the

⁴⁸ Theodoret, *Hist. eccles.* 5, 36; PG, 82, cols. 1265 seq.; GCS, 19, ed. L. Parmentier, pp. 338 seq.; Theophanes, *ad. ann.* 5930, ed. Bonn, p. 143 seq.; de Boor, pp. 92 seq.

BIRTH OF THE ANDREW TRADITION

church for this purpose was the Church historian Sozomen, who wrote his Church History about 440. Reporting the funeral of Constantine, he says:⁴⁹ "When Constantius, who was in the East, learned of the death of his father, which was speedily reported to him, he came quickly to Constantinople; and he gave him an imperial funeral and buried him in the church named for the apostles, where Constantine himself, while still living, prepared his own tomb. And from this the custom took its beginning, and the Christian emperors who died in Constantinople after this were laid there. Likewise bishops were buried there, since the priestly dignity is of the same honor as the imperial dignity; or rather in holy places, the priestly dignity takes first place."

When we compare this report with that given by Socrates, we detect a certain correlation between the two. Socrates is, however, more moderate and comes nearer the truth than Sozomen. The latter tries to give his own explanation of Socrates' words βασιλεῖς τε καὶ ἐπεῖς. He does not deny the sacerdotal character of the *basileia*, but gives the emperors equal status with the bishops. However, he stresses the precedence of bishops over emperors in the church, that is, in the liturgy, implying thereby that the *sacerdotium* is, in this way, more important than the *imperium*. This seems to have been Sozomen's general attitude towards the *basileia*, and its relationship with the Church.⁵⁰ The deposition of the relics of St. John Chrysostom in the church of the Holy Apostles gave him a welcome opportunity of expressing his ideas.

Another incident which helped to break the "imperial charm" that had thus far surrounded the church of the Holy Apostles, was the burial there of St. Flavian, Bishop of Constantinople. Flavian was deposed in 449 by the "Robber synod" of Ephesus and died shortly afterwards. His death was attributed by his followers to his ill treatment at the hands of the heretics who had deposed him. The Empress Pulcheria ordered the transfer of his relics to the Church of the Holy Apostles in 451.⁵¹

⁴⁹ *Hist. eccles.*, 2, 34; *PG*, 67, col. 1032.

⁵⁰ Sozomen's political ideas will be treated more fully in the author's book on the "Origins of Christian Political Philosophy," now in preparation.

⁵¹ Theophanes, *ad. ann.* 5942, ed. Bonn, p. 158; de Boor, p. 102. It is important to note that Theodosius I did not dare to bury St. Paul, Bishop of

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

Thus it seems that, because of the transfer of the relics of St. John Chrysostom and St. Flavian to the Church of the Holy Apostles, and particularly because of Sozomen's interpretation of Socrates' report on the burial-place of emperors and priests, the patriarchs of Constantinople were, in the second half of the fifth century, sufficiently linked to the apostles—especially to St. Andrew—to fire the imagination of those who were jealously anxious to promote their prestige even further. It is no wonder, therefore, that the origin of the tradition that the bishopric of Constantinople was founded by the Apostle Andrew is dated by some in the period of the Acacian schism (485–519).⁵²

There is actually in existence a document which, if genuine, would indicate that the tradition concerning the founding of the bishopric of Byzantium by St. Andrew must have started at least in the second half of the fifth century, if not much earlier. This is the catalogue of the seventy disciples of Christ, which includes a list of bishops from Andrew to Metrophanes as well as a list of the apostles. This catalogue is ascribed to Dorotheus, Bishop of Tyre, who is said to have suffered great persecution during the reign of Diocletian, and to have lived to the reign of Julian. He died a martyr's death under Licinius when he had reached the one hundred and seventh year of his life.⁵³ In addition to biographical data on the legendary author, the compilation contains a report of an incident supposed to have happened at Constantinople on the occasion

Constantinople (340–341, 342–344, 348–350), who had been killed by the Arians, in the church of the Holy Apostles. He transferred his relics to Constantinople, but they were deposited in the church that Paul's antagonist, Bishop Macedonius had built (Theophanes, *ad. ann.* 5876, ed. Bonn, p. 109; ed. de Boor, p. 69). In 377 the "imperial charm" surrounding the church of the Holy Apostles was still too strong.

⁵² Cf. S. Vailhé, "Origines de l'Eglise de Constantinople," *Echos d'Orient*, 10 (1907), p. 293.

⁵³ On Pseudo-Dorotheus see Th. Schermann, "Propheten und Apostellegenden nebst Jüngerkatalogen des Dorotheus und verwandter Texte," *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, 31 (Leipzig, 1907), pp. 174–198. Cf. also *infra*, p. 178. There is no evidence for the existence of a Bishop of Tyre of this name. Some confusion seems to exist about two men of this name—a priest, Dorotheus of Antioch, who was previously director of a purple dye-house in Tyre, and a courtier of the same name who died a martyr's death under Diocletian. Both are mentioned by Eusebius (*Hist. eccles.*, 7, 32; 8, 1, 6; *PG*, 20, cols. 721, 740, 753; *GCS*, 9, ed. E. Schwartz, pp. 716, 736, 748).

BIRTH OF THE ANDREW TRADITION

of Pope John I's visit in 525.⁵⁴ Invited by the Patriarch of Constantinople to join him in celebrating the liturgy on Christmas Day, the Pope is said to have declined the invitation and to have insisted on celebrating the liturgy before the Patriarch did, inasmuch as his see was older than that of Constantinople. He was then presented with the document translated for this occasion by Procopius from Dorotheus' description of the activity of the seventy disciples. This contained a story relating that St. Andrew "while navigating in the Sea of Pontus, instituted as Bishop of Byzantium in Argyropolis of Thrace, Stachys—of whom mention is made in the Epistle to the Romans." After studying the document, the Pope acknowledged its authenticity, but continued to claim the right of precedence over the Patriarch, as he was the successor to the Prince of the Apostles. This prerogative was recognized by his colleague in Constantinople, who was satisfied to have had it proved that his see was an older foundation than that of Rome.

The compiler of this story enumerates twenty other bishops who succeeded Stachys, in an uninterrupted series, down to Metrophanes, the first bishop whose name can be traced with certainty, and who held the see under Constantine the Great.⁵⁵ This catalogue forms the basis of numerous lists of patriarchs of Constantinople which sometimes contain many variations.⁵⁶

However, a more thorough examination of the story of John I's visit contained in the compilation shows that it is completely legendary. The story is contradicted by a contemporary account of the voyage made by Pope Agapetus to Constantinople in 536,⁵⁷ eleven years after the incident said to have occurred in Constantinople in 525. The author of this later account has no knowledge of

⁵⁴ PG, 92, col. 1072 (*De Septuginta discipulis Domini et duodecim Apostolis*, cols. 1060–1073). Th. Schermann, in his collective edition *Prophetarum vitae fabulosae, indices apostolorum discipulorumque Domini Dorotheo, Epiphanio, Hippolyto aliisque vindicata* (Leipzig, 1907), pp. 151 seq.

⁵⁵ This is attested by the *Chronicon Paschale*, ed. Bonn, p. 522; by Theophanes, ad ann. 5799, ed. Bonn, p. 19; ed. de Boor, p. 13, note 18, and by Photius, *Bibliotheca*, cods. 88, 256, PG, 103, col. 292; 104, cols. 105 seq.

⁵⁶ On these catalogues see M. F. Fischer, *De patriarcharum Constantinopolitanorum Catalogis et de chronologia primorum patriarcharum*, published in *Commentarii philologici Jenenses*, 3 (Leipzig, 1894), pp. 263–333.

⁵⁷ The account is quoted *in extenso* by Cardinal Caesar Baronius in his *Annales Ecclesiastici*, ad ann. 536, ed. A. Pagi, (Lucca, 1738–1759), nos. 59–63.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

the incident reported in the compilation nor, what is even more important, of the catalogue of bishops who, according to the document ascribed to Dorotheus, had succeeded Stachys in the see of Byzantium. The chronicler enumerates the bishops of Byzantium from Metrophanes onward, and the Patriarch Epiphanius who occupied the see of Constantinople from 520 to 536 is the twentieth in the series. Further on in the account, when speaking of the ordination of Epiphanius' successor, Menas, by the Pope himself, the author distinctly states that Menas was the twenty-first Bishop of Constantinople.

This, surely, is a very important statement. The anonymous author of this account seems to have followed the official diptychs of Constantinople. He evidently leaves out the heretical patriarchs whose names did not appear in the diptychs, which could mean that, in 536, in the *patriarcheion* of Constantinople, the legendary account of the apostolic origin of the see of Byzantium was not yet known, and that, even if there had been some bishops in Byzantium before Metrophanes, their names were not inscribed in the diptychs which began with the bishop who occupied the see when the little town of Byzantium became Constantinopolis, capital of the Empire.

There are, moreover, strong indications that the legendary account reported by the document ascribed to Dorotheus was unknown, at least in Rome, during the pontificate of Gregory the Great (590-604). This Pope held the Apostle Andrew in particular veneration, and devoted to him a special homily which he preached in the Basilica of St. Andrew in Rome⁵⁸ on the day of Andrew's commemoration. In this, of course, he linked Peter with his brother, giving Peter precedence over Andrew, but he nevertheless referred to Andrew with great respect, and urged the Romans to follow Andrew's example.

In another homily, when speaking about the missionary work of the apostles and of Christ's disciples, he singled out only five apostles, presenting them as they bring their converts before the Lord:⁵⁹ Peter, who had to do with the people of all Judaea, Paul with those from virtually the whole world, Andrew with those of

⁵⁸ *Homiliae in Evangelia*, Hom. 5, PL, 76, cols. 1092-1095.

⁵⁹ *Homiliae in Evangelia*, Hom. 17, PL, 76, col. 1148.

BIRTH OF THE ANDREW TRADITION

Achaea, John with those of Asia, and Thomas with those of India.

It was also because of this predilection of Gregory for Andrew that the Apostle's name was added by the Pope to the prayer *Liberamus* in the canon of the Mass of the Roman rite.⁶⁰ The names of only three Apostles are listed in this prayer: Saints Peter, Paul, and Andrew; and it is certainly very significant that Gregory the Great gave so prominent a place to St. Andrew in the Roman liturgy.

Gregory had testified to this veneration for the Apostle Andrew at the beginning of his ecclesiastical career when, after renouncing the world and devoting the vast fortune inherited from his father to the construction of monasteries, he dedicated to the Apostle the monastery into which he had transformed his family palace about the year 574.⁶¹ There he lived first as a simple monk. His biographer John the Deacon says⁶² that he was believed to have administered the affairs of his monastery not alone, but jointly with St. Andrew.

Bearing all this in mind, it is logical to suppose that Gregory had collected, during his stay in Constantinople from 579 to 586, as legate of Pope Pelagius, all the information available on St. Andrew and his relics. He must very often have venerated the supposed relics of the Patron Saint of his monastery in the church of the Holy Apostles. According to a record preserved in the papal archives consulted by Baronius,⁶³ he was given, for his monastery, two very

⁶⁰ H. Grisar, "Der gelasianische Messkanon," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 10 (1886), pp. 30 seq. J. Beran, *op. cit.*, pp. 81-87, doubts that this addition was made by Gregory the Great. In view of the fact that the cult of St. Andrew had spread in Rome before Gregory, he thinks that the name of Andrew could already have been added to the prayer in the fifth century. This is possible, but no new argument against the earlier opinion was produced by Beran.

⁶¹ Joannes Diaconus, *S. Gregorii Magni vita*, 1, chap. 6, *PL*, 75, col. 65.

⁶² *Ibid.*, chap. 10, col. 66: *tantis est virtutibus publicatus, ut omnibus secum viventibus, et exemplo fuerit, et terrori, quippe qui non solus, sed socialiter cum beato Andrea apostolo, suo monasterio, signis evidentibus, sit prae-fuisse putatus.*

⁶³ C. Baronius, *Annales Ecclesiastici*, ad ann. 586, 10, ed. A. Theiner (Bar-le-Duc, 1867), chap. 25, p. 391: *Gregorius igitur tempore Tiberii eo bene functus munere, illo defuncto, Romam reversus est et quidem magnis donatus muneribus, nempe sacrosanctis reliquiis Andreae Apostoli, et Lucae Evangelistae, quas nuper tempore Justiniani refossas et honorificentiori loco reconditas vidimus. Quod enim (ut dictum est) erexisset in Urbe in Caelii montis regione ad clivum Scauri monasterium Gregorius sub titulo S. Andreae, ejusdem sancti reliquias sibi dari petiit ab imperatore; quas et accepit insignes quidem nempe brachium*

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

precious relics by the Emperor—an arm of St. Andrew and the head of St. Luke.

As has been seen, Gregory the Great, when he became Pope, was careful to keep himself well-informed about the situation in Constantinople. Would this Pope, the valiant defender of Roman primacy who, at every opportunity, stressed so strongly the apostolicity of his see, have been such a fervent admirer of St. Andrew if he had known that the prestige of this Apostle had been debased—as it would have been in his eyes—to provide the see of Constantinople with the privilege of an apostolic foundation? It is in fact quite safe to conclude, on the basis of Gregory's attitude, that, until the beginning of the seventh century, the account of the apostolic origin of Byzantium, contained in the writing ascribed to Dorotheus, was not known either in Rome or in Constantinople.⁶⁴

All of these considerations point to the end of the sixth and the beginning of the seventh centuries as the possible *terminus a quo* for the definitive formation of the legendary Andrew tradition concerning Byzantium.⁶⁵ The new controversy as to the title of the oecumenical patriarch, which aroused ecclesiastics in Rome and Constantinople, might have suggested to some anonymous zealot

S. Andreae cum capite S. Lucae. Et de his in Vaticanis monumentis vetus assertio in priori pagina Codicis signati numero centesimo quinquagesimo tertio. Extat adhuc in eodem monasterio S. Andreae ipsum ejusdem Apostoli brachium argentea theca ornatum... caput vero sancti Lucae in Basilica Vaticana reconditum, ibi haecenus honorifice asservatur. Cf. F. H. Dudden, *Gregory the Great, His Place in History and Thought*, 1 (London, 1905), pp. 119, 157.

⁶⁴ The cult of the apostles and of Christ's disciples spread in the West during the sixth century. That the interest in apocryphal stories concerning their lives also increased is clear from the popularity of the writings of Gregory of Tours on the apostles—particularly on Andrew—and by the eagerness with which the relics of Andrew were sought for some western churches. Cf. Gregory's *Liber in gloria martyrum*, 1, chaps. 25–32 (on the apostles); *MGH, Ss. Rer. Merov.* 1, pp. 503–508. In chapter 30 (pp. 505 seq.) Gregory reports some miracles ascribed to Andrew, and mentions also (pp. 506, 540) that the churches of Neuvy-le-Roi, near Tours, and of Agde were privileged to possess some of Andrew's relics. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 826, Gregory's *Liber de miraculis S. Andreae Apostoli*, about which more will be found on pp. 183 seq. In his *Historia Francorum*, 4, chap. 31, *ibid.*, p. 167, Gregory mentions the church of St. Andrew at Clermont Ferrand.

⁶⁵ This is also the opinion of L. Duchesne in his book, *L'Eglise au VI^e siècle* (Paris, 1925), p. 76.

BIRTH OF THE ANDREW TRADITION

in Constantinople the idea of enhancing the prestige of the see of the residential city by promoting it to an apostolic foundation. In this way the only great prerogative held by Rome over Constantinople would be levelled, and the two cities would be equal in every respect.

Actually, insofar as can be determined, the first documents attributing an apostolic character to the see of Constantinople also date from the beginning of the seventh century. Of special interest among these is a composition of Arcadius, Archbishop of Cyprus, who lived under the reign of Phocas (602–610) and Heraclius (610–641). In his biography of St. Symeon of the Marvelous Mountain (ὁ θαυμαστοορετης), who lived from 521 to 596, he calls the see of the Imperial City apostolic on two occasions.⁶⁶ He reports the prophecy of the Saint that John Scholasticos would become Patriarch of Constantinople, and this came to pass after the death of Eutychius (582). The case is especially interesting because the new Patriarch in question is John IV, called “the Faster.” This did not mean that John IV regarded his see as of apostolic character, although such seems, to have been Arcadius’ conviction when he wrote this biography.

Another hagiographer of the same period, Eleusios, also called George, expresses the same high opinion of the character of the see of Constantinople. He is the author of the Life of St. Theodore, who died, according to his hagiographer, in the third year of Heraclius’ reign (613). The Life was written soon after the Saint’s death, and it is worth-while reading for anyone interested in the reigns of Maurikios, Phocas, and Heraclius. It is written in a very lively style and provides useful information on the Patriarchs of this period—Cyriacus, Thomas I, and Sergius. In two instances the hagiographer calls the see of Constantinople apostolic, first when he announces that the monastery of St. Theodore was placed directly under the patriarch of Constantinople, and again when he describes how Sergius, the new holder of the see, asked the Saint

⁶⁶ A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Περὶ τινος συγγραφῆς Ἀρκαδίου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κύπρου. *Vizantijskij Vremennik*, 1 (1894), p. 608: καὶ γὰρ τῷ ἀποστολικῷ θρόνῳ τῆς βασιλευούσης πόλεως ἀπεκλήρωσέ σε ὁ Θεός. P. 609: ἐξεβλήθη τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ θρόνου τῆς βασιλευούσης πόλεως Εὐτύχιος ὁ ἀγιώτατος πατριάρχης.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

to pray that "the Lord may make him worthy of the episcopal dignity and of the apostolic throne."⁶⁷

At the same time the title "apostolic" is applied to Constantinople in an official document, a novel issued by the Emperor Heraclius (sometime between 620 and 629), and addressed to the Patriarch Sergius (610-638).⁶⁸ This novel specified regulations regarding the reception of clerics who came to Constantinople uninvited by the patriarch, and it seems to have been an isolated instance, at least insofar as can be judged since the official documents of the following period are only very unsatisfactorily preserved.

Moreover, two other Patriarchs had been buried in the Church of the Holy Apostles. St. Eutychius, Patriarch of Constantinople from 552-565 and again from 577 to about 582, was interred there.⁶⁹ This honor may be explained by the fact that Eutychius died with a reputation of sanctity. Theophanes⁷⁰ also reports the burial of Domitian, Bishop of Melitene, in the same Church in the year A.D. 602. The Bishop was a relative of the Emperor which may explain why he was so honored. Thus, the link connecting the see of Byzantium with the Apostle Andrew became stronger.

The Acts of the Sixth Oecumenical Council held in Constantinople in 680 also clearly show how the use of the title "apostolic see" had spread in Byzantium during the seventh century. In these Rome is called the "apostolic see" more often than in the acts of previous councils, and when the names of its legates are mentioned they are almost always introduced as representatives of the apostolic see of Old Rome,⁷¹ although the bishops still frequently contented them-

⁶⁷ Theophilos Joannou, *Μνημεία ἀγιολογικά* (Venice, 1884), Βίος ὁσίου Θεοδόρου, chap. 82, p. 437: ὑπὸ τὸν ἀποστολικὸν θρόνον τῆς ἀγιωτάτης τοῦ Θεοῦ μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας, chap. 135, p. 484: ἄξιον αὐτὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς καὶ τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ θρόνου ποιήσασα.

⁶⁸ J. Zepos, P. Zepos, *Novellae et aureae bullae imperatorum post Justinianum* (Athens, 1931), Nov. 24, *Jus Graeco-romanum*, I, p. 33: τοῦ τὸν ἀποστολικὸν ταύτης διέποντος θρόνου οἰκουμενικοῦ πατριάρχου. This title is used only in the introduction to the novel, not in the novel itself.

⁶⁹ H. Delehaye, *Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae (Propylaeum ad Acta Sanctorum Novembris)*, (Brussels, 1902), cols. 587 seq.

⁷⁰ *Chronographia*, ad ann. 6094; ed. Bonn, p. 438; ed. de Boor, p. 284.

⁷¹ Mansi, II, cols. 200D, 201E, 212D, 213B, 216C, 220E, 225A, 297E, 320C, 325C, 329D, 332A, 368C, 388A, 392D, 509B, 528E, 588B, 625C, 640E, 641A, 644E, 660C, 665C,D, 669B,C.

BIRTH OF THE ANDREW TRADITION

selves with referring to Agathon simply as the Pope of Old Rome.⁷²

It should be noted that the Emperor Constantine IV showed greater logic than the bishops, both in his letters and when mentioning the see of Rome during the debates.⁷³ In his letter to Agathon, announcing the convocation of the Council, the Emperor gave to the Pope the title of "Oecumenical Pope," as he did also to the Patriarch of Constantinople.⁷⁴

In the same letter⁷⁵ he spoke in general, of "God's most holy catholic and apostolic Churches," meaning, evidently, the five patriarchates. That such was his intention is indicated by the Emperor's order, pronounced at the end of the eighteenth meeting, that the decisions of the Synod be sent to the five patriarchal sees. The sees were enumerated as follows:⁷⁶ "To the see of the holy Peter, Coryphaeus of the Apostles, namely, to the most holy Agatho, Pope of Old Rome. To the see of the most holy, catholic, and apostolic great Church of Constantinople, namely to George, the most holy and most blessed Patriarch. To the apostolic see of the holy Evangelist, Mark, who is honored in the great city of the Alexandrians through Peter, the most beloved by God, priest, monk, and legate. To the see of the Antiochenes or Theopolitans, the great city, through Theophanes the most holy and blessed Patriarch. To the see of the Holy Resurrection of our Lord Christ, God, namely to Jerusalem. . . ." Here, then, is found the beginning of the pentarchic idea, namely that the whole Church should be governed by the five patriarchs. Because the patriarchs represented the apostles, all patriarchal sees were to be regarded as apostolic. This idea was particularly defined in the Acts of the Ignatian Council of 869-870.⁷⁷

⁷² *Ibid.*, *Actio* 8 (cols. 336 seq.), the bishops' opinions on Agathon's letter. 684 seq., letter of the Council to the Pope.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, cols. 197A, 360C, 392D, 509E, 716E, 719A,D.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, col. 196: τῷ ἀγιωτάτῳ καὶ μακαριωτάτῳ ἀρχιεπισκόπῳ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης, καὶ οἰκουμενικῷ πάπῃ. The letter starts with a eulogy of Rome, the basis of Constantine IV's imperial dignity. Cf. col. 201 seq., letter to the Patriarch, and col. 713, letter to Pope Leo. See also col. 737, letter to Pope John. When signing the decrees of the Council, at the end of the eighteenth session, the legates call the Pope also "oecumenical," *ibid.*, cols. 640, 668.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, col. 200C.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, cols. 681 seq.

⁷⁷ See *infra*, pp. 268.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

In the imperial letter of Constantine IV the apostolic designation is given especially to the three main sees, i. e. Rome, Constantinople and Alexandria, but this was not the only time that the see of Constantinople was called apostolic. It was so called frequently during the Synod, especially when the deacons of the *patriarcheion*—Constantine and Theodore—who acted as secretaries or readers at the Council, were mentioned.⁷⁸ They were given almost the same titles as the Roman legates when their intervention in the debates was announced. This was the first time, in an official ecclesiastical document, that the title of apostolic see had been given categorically to Constantinople.

It raises, however, another problem. Was Andrew's connection with the Church of Constantinople responsible for this promotion of the Constantinopolitan see? If so, it would mean that the document, attributed to Dorotheus, cataloguing the bishops of Byzantium from Andrew and Stachys onward, was perhaps already known in Constantinople in the sixth century, and that its authenticity was generally accepted in the seventh century. It seems very doubtful, however, that this was so. A very important source may be quoted which completely ignores the Stachys Legend and the Pseudo-Dorotheus catalogue of Byzantine bishops, in spite of its having been written in the first half of the seventh century during the reign of the Emperor Heraclius (610–641). This is the *Chronicon Paschale*. Its anonymous author lists Metrophanes as the first Bishop of Constantinople,⁷⁹ ignoring the long list of his supposed predecessors presented by Pseudo-Dorotheus.

It might be argued that the anonymous Church historian was here simply copying his predecessor, the Church historian, Socrates, a native of Constantinople.⁸⁰ Of course Socrates could have known nothing about the legendary tradition, for, as had already been shown, it was not in existence in the fifth century when he wrote

⁷⁸ Mansi, II, cols. 389E, 460D (in the Latin translation the title "apostolic" is often omitted), 521D, 553B, 585D, 616E, 624B, 629D. Of other eastern apostolic sees, only Jerusalem eagerly seeks this title, *ibid.*, col. 640E, 669A.

⁷⁹ Ed. Bonn, p. 522, PG, 92, col. 700: τῆς ἐν τῷ Βυζαντίῳ ἐκκλησίας ἡγεῖται πρῶτος Μητροφάνης ἐτη ι'. Bonn, p. 524; PG, *ibid.*, col. 701: Alexander is said to have been the second Bishop of Constantinople.

⁸⁰ *Hist. eccles.*, I, 37; PG, 67, col. 173: τότε τῆς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει προεστῶς Ἀλέξανδρος ἐκκλησίας, Μητροφάνην πάλαι διαδεξάμενος.

BIRTH OF THE ANDREW TRADITION

his history. Socrates was not emphatic in declaring Metrophanes first Bishop of Constantinople, and this might explain why the Socrates tradition was ignored after the Andrew Legend became known.

However, when the *Chronicon Paschale* is more thoroughly perused, it must be concluded that its anonymous author could not have known of the list of apostles and disciples contained in the compilation attributed to Pseudo-Dorotheus, for his own list of the apostles and of the seventy disciples is a much simpler one.⁸¹ In it he quotes Andrew second after Peter. He also mentions Stachys, but says nothing of Andrew's supposed connection with the foundation of the bishopric of Byzantium. This is the more noteworthy in that he speaks of the sees of Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria as apostolic foundations, and is well acquainted with their relationship to Peter.⁸²

All of this is important. It is logical to conclude that the anonymous Church historian of the seventh century knew nothing of the Andrew and Stachys Legend concerning Byzantium, and that, in the first half of the seventh century, the Pseudo-Dorotheus lists of apostles and disciples were not in circulation in Constantinople. Such a conclusion is further confirmed by the fact that the author of the *Chronicon Paschale* quotes, as the source of his information on the apostles and disciples, the *Hypotyposis* written by Clement of Alexandria. This work, now lost, was known also to the first Church historian Eusebius,⁸³ who, when numbering Cephas, whom he distinguishes from Peter, among the seventy disciples, quotes the same source as the anonymous *Chronicon*—the fifth book of Clement's *Hypotyposis*. This is somewhat surprising because this same Eusebius writes, in another passage,⁸⁴ that at this time a complete list of the seventy disciples did not exist. Apparently, therefore, the list given by Clement was incomplete, and the story of Stachys

⁸¹ *Chronicon Paschale*, ed. Bonn, pp. 399, 401; *PG*, 92, cols. 520, 521, Cf. *infra*, p. 176.

⁸² *Chron. Paschale*, *ibid.*, pp. 416, 421, 431, 432; *PG*, *ibid.*, cols. 540, 545, 557, 560.

⁸³ *Hist. eccles.* 1, 12, 2; ed. E. Schwartz, 1, p. 82, *PG*, 20, col. 117.

⁸⁴ *Hist. eccles.* 1, 12, 1; ed. E. Schwartz, *ibid.*, p. 80, *PG*, *ibid.* Cf. R. A. Lipsius, *Die apokr. Apost.*, 1, pt. 1, p. 201.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

was not known to Clement, to Eusebius, or to the anonymous author of the *Chronicon Paschale*.

This indicates that the new idea of terming the see of Constantinople apostolic, could hardly have been put into circulation by the statements of the Pseudo-Dorotheus document attributing the foundation of the see of Byzantium to St. Andrew. How, therefore, could such an innovation have been introduced? The anonymous author of the *Chronicon Paschale* may be of help in supplying an answer to this question. On several occasions, when speaking of liturgical feasts introduced into the Church calendar, he stresses that they are celebrated annually on fixed dates by "God's catholic and apostolic Church."⁸⁵ It is obvious from the text that he had in mind not so much the universal Church in general as the Church to which he belonged, the Eastern Church including that of Byzantium, which he calls catholic and apostolic.

It is reasonable to see in this the influence of the Roman emphasis on the apostolic character of the Church in general and of the Roman see in particular. Under this strong influence the idea of the apostolicity of the Church found more appreciation in Byzantium also, and the custom of calling the see of Constantinople apostolic should in a sense, therefore, be attributed to the Roman influence.

There may be, however, an additional explanation of the origin of this usage insofar as it concerns Byzantium. It has been seen⁸⁶ that, when the Byzantines started referring to their patriarch as "oecumenical" they intended not to reserve the designation exclusively for the holder of the see of the capital city, but to give it also to the patriarch of Rome. This can easily be explained. According to the Byzantine conception, since Constantinople was called the New Rome, the holder of its see should enjoy the same titles as the holder of the see of the Old Rome—as is suggested in the canons confirming Constantinople's rank in the Church—and this should also apply in reverse. Because the holder of the see of the Old Rome called his Church apostolic, there was no reason to refuse

⁸⁵ Ed. Bonn, pp. 373: the Feast of the Annunciation, March 25: ἐορτάζει τὸν εὐαγγελισμόν τῆς ἁγίας δεσποίνης ἡμῶν ἐνδόξου θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία. 393 (Epiphany), 417 (feasts in general), 429 (Easter). *PG*, 92, cols. 488, 512, 540, 553.

⁸⁶ See *supra*, p. 163. Cf. also pp. 77, 79.

BIRTH OF THE ANDREW TRADITION

to the holder of the see of New Rome the same privilege. If it is true that the Andrew Legend was unknown in Byzantium in the seventh century, there can be no other reason for the origin of this practice in Constantinople.

For the following period at least, one document may be quoted to indicate that the see of Constantinople continued to be called apostolic. Written in 713 by Agatho, chartophylac of the church of Hagia Sophia,⁸⁷ it describes the reign, as well as the fall, of the usurper Basiliscus, and records the proclamation of the new Emperor Anastasius II. In his account of the election of Anastasius II, he reports that the new Emperor was first proclaimed "in God's most holy catholic and apostolic great church, and crowned by the Archpriest and Patriarch John in the holy and most venerable *thysiasterion* [sanctuary]." The deacon refers, of course, to the church of the Patriarch, the Hagia Sophia.

The title was, however, not yet used officially by the patriarchs themselves, as can be inferred from the letter sent by the Patriarch John to Pope Constantine I. In its address the writer does not give this title either to himself or to the Pope, but within the letter he twice calls the Roman see "apostolic."⁸⁸

The approach of the iconoclastic period brought new developments. Although it would have seemed natural for the iconoclasts to have favored this idea as giving more prestige to the see of Constantinople, it appears, on the contrary, that the iconoclastic emperors preferred to hark back to the old Hellenistic definition of imperial power, stressing the priestly character of the *basileia*.⁸⁹

⁸⁷ Mansi, 12, col. 193C: ἀναγορευθῆς πρῶτον ἐν τῇ ἀγιωτάτῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ καθολικῇ καὶ ἀποστολικῇ μεγάλῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ στεφθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ πατριάρχου Ἰωάννου ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ πανσέπτῳ θυσιαστηρίῳ.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, cols. 200A, 205D.

⁸⁹ M. Anastos will deal more fully with this problem in his study, 'Εκκλησία καὶ πολιτεία εἰς τὴν πρώτην εἰκονομαχικὴν περίοδον, to be published in Athens in 1958(?) in a *Festschrift* honoring Hamilcar Alivizatos. As far as Andrew himself is concerned, his prestige seems to have been respected also by the iconoclasts, as indicated by the confirmation of privileges given to the metropolitan of Patras by Nicephorus II (802-811) and by Leo V (813-820). Leo V is said by Constantine Porphyrogenitus (*De administrando imperio*, chap. 49; ed. Bonn, pp. 217-220; ed. Moravcsik-Jenkins, pp. 231 seq.) to have fixed the tributes which the Slavs were to render to the metropolitan after their defeat in 805 by the citizens of Patras, whose victory had been won with the help of St. Andrew who had been seen leading his worshipers in battle.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

Because of this they were inclined to exalt the position of the emperors in religious matters, at the expense of the priests, particularly since the patriarchs of the truly apostolic sees did not favor the iconoclastic doctrine.

So it came about that the apostolic idea became a weapon for the defenders of the image cult against the intervention of emperors in the doctrinal field. It can thus be said that the iconoclastic struggles contributed in great measure to the definitive acceptance of the principle of apostolicity by the Byzantine Church. As a logical consequence, the principle that Church affairs should be decided by the five patriarchs—the so-called pentarchic idea—was also considerably strengthened during the iconoclastic period by the defenders of images.

This is especially clear in the writings of St. Theodore of Studios, one of the most prominent defenders of the cult of images. He was anxious to deny to emperors the right of intervention in matters of faith;⁹⁰ so he stressed the thesis that decisions in dogmatic affairs were the exclusive concern of the Church, represented not by the emperor, but by the five patriarchs of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, who were the successors of the apostles. He pointed out, too, that the decision of one of the patriarchs was not sufficient, but that the consent of all five was necessary, and that the iconoclastic council which was approved only by the Emperor and his heretical Patriarch, and condemned by the other four patriarchal sees, was therefore without value.

Theodore emphasized above all the apostolicity of the see of Old Rome because the popes were the most valiant defenders of the cult of images. On some occasions he gave the Pope the title of *apostolicus*,⁹¹ but this did not mean that he endowed only the first patriarch with apostolicity. In his letter to Thomas, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, whom he called in one instance the first of the

⁹⁰ In this respect Theodore follows St. John of Damascus whose plea for the cult of images contains a very outspoken condemnation of imperial interventions in religious matters. (*De Imaginibus, orationes tres*, 2, PG, 94, cols. 1296 seq.)

⁹¹ Letter to Pope Leo (*Theodori Studitae Epistolae*, 1, *Epist.* 34, PG, 99, cols. 1021A, 1025D); Letter to Epiphanius (*ibid.*, 2, *Epist.*, 35, col. 1209D); Letter to the Patriarch Thomas of Jerusalem, (*ibid.*, *Epist.* 121, col. 1397A). Cf. also Letter to Naucratus (*ibid.*, *Epist.* 63, col. 1281B).

BIRTH OF THE ANDREW TRADITION

patriarchs, although he was the fifth of the series,⁹² Theodore also stressed the apostolicity of the see of Jerusalem⁹³ and called the Pope the *apostolicus* of the West.⁹⁴ which implies that there were also *apostolici* of the East.

An important passage from Theodore's letter to Leo the Sacellarius⁹⁵ shows clearly that this is what Theodore had in mind. He says in the text: "There is no discussion about secular things. To judge them is the right of the emperor and the secular tribunal. But [there is discussion] about divine and celestial decisions, and these are not committed to others than those to whom God the Word himself said, 'Whatsoever you shall bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven, and whatsoever you shall loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven' [Matt. 16:19]. Who are the men to whom this order was given? The apostles and their successors. And who are their successors? He who holds the throne of Rome, which is the first; he who holds the throne of Constantinople, the second; and after them they who hold those of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. This is the pentarchic authority of the Church; these have jurisprudence over divine dogmas. To the emperor and to the secular authority belong the giving of assistance and the confirming of what has been decided."

It is clear from Theodore's words that he likewise counted the patriarch of Constantinople among the successors of the apostles; so he must have regarded the see of Constantinople as an apostolic see, similar to the others. He argued further that when one of the five patriarchs deviates from the truth, he must be judged, not by the emperor, but by the other patriarchs. The passage is important, too, from another point of view. Theodore recognized the emperor's right to convoke a council, but insisted also on the prominent position of the pope in general councils. If the convocation of a council was not desired by the emperor, he recommended that the case be submitted to the Roman patriarch for decision. The content of the letter as a whole indicates that Theodore opposed the secular

⁹² *Ibid.*, *Epist.* 15, col. 1161A.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, *Epist.* 121, col. 1396C: οἷγε τῷ ἀποστολικῷ βαθμῷ ὑπερανестῶτες, καὶ τὸ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ δι' ἐννόμου διαδοχῆς ἐπέχοντες πρόσωπον . . .

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, *Epist.* 121, col. 1397A: ὁ τῆς Δύσεως ἀποστολικός.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, *Epist.* 124, col. 1417C.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

power of the emperors as against the sacerdotal power of the patriarchs, which they inherited from the apostles. This strengthens the assumption that he regarded the see of Constantinople as an apostolic see.

Theodore's giving of the title *apostolicus* to the popes finds a supplementary explanation in the fact that this was the West's official title for the Pope at that time.⁹⁶ Theodore of Studios must have known that. He was in constant touch with the Greek monasteries in Rome,⁹⁷ and it is not unreasonable to suppose that he learned from his Greek correspondents⁹⁸ how to address the Pope in his letters. He was surely quite ready to adopt this title for it expressed his own belief that dogmatic questions could be decided only by the five patriarchs, the successors of the supreme teachers of the faith—the apostles—among whom the successor to St. Peter was the foremost.

Theodore's attitude is certainly important, and it illustrates particularly clearly the growth of the idea of apostolicity in Byzantium. In official documents, however, no clear evidence of this new tradition can be found. In the Acts of the Seventh Oecumenical Council the Pope and the Patriarch of Constantinople are given the usual titles—"most holy Pope of Old Rome, most holy Patriarch of Constantinople, that is New Rome." Rome is called "apostolic see"; so also are the sees of the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem.⁹⁹ Only once does Tarasius seem to raise his voice as an apostle, and that is when he addresses the Eastern patriarchs, inviting them to send legates to the Council: "I beseech you as brethren, and in the language of the Apostle, as though God did beseech you by us, I entreat you" Another allusion to the apostolicity of the patriarchal sees can be found in the same letter when he apostrophizes as his "allies, fellow-warriors, fellow combatants"¹⁰⁰ the Eastern patriarchs whose sees have been built upon

⁹⁶ The author has discussed the problem in detail in his book *Les Légendes de Constantin et de Méthode, vues de Byzance*, (Prague, 1933), pp. 297 seq.

⁹⁷ On Greek monasteries in Rome see *ibid.*, pp. 285 seq.

⁹⁸ See Theodore's letter to Basil, Abbot of one of the monasteries in Rome (*Epist.* 1, 35, *PG*, 99, cols. 1028 seq.) Cf. also Theodore's letter to Epiphanius (*ibid.*, 2, *Epist.* 35, col. 1209).

⁹⁹ Mansi, 12, 13, especially at the beginning of each session.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 12, col. 1126C, D.

BIRTH OF THE ANDREW TRADITION

the foundation of prophets and apostles, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief cornerstone" (Eph. 2:20).

This is, of course, slight testimony, but the Eastern patriarchs in their reply to Tarasius, while laying great stress on the apostolicity of their sees and calling Hadrian I "Holy and Apostolic Pope," do not seem to deny the title to the Patriarch of Constantinople. They address their letter "to the most holy and most blessed Lord and Master, Archbishop of Constantinople and Oecumenical Patriarch," but they praise also "the most holy and divinely inspired epistle of your Paternal and Apostolic Holiness."¹⁰¹

A very faint echo of Theodore's teaching as to the supreme role that the five patriarchs should play in the Church can be discovered in the refutation of the iconoclastic council by the Deacon John, read at the beginning of the sixth session. This declared that that council could not be called oecumenical because the patriarchs of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem were not represented and had not accepted its decisions.¹⁰²

Thus it appears that the importance of apostolic origins in Church organization was fully grasped in Constantinople at the end of the seventh and the beginning of the eighth centuries. Thanks to the defenders of image worship, the idea of apostolicity in Constantinople had considerably advanced. It would, therefore, seem quite logical to look for some kind of codification of the Andrew tradition in this period, and this problem deserves a more thorough examination.

The key to the dating of the writings containing the Andrew and Stachys stories is probably to be found in the *Martyrium sancti Apostoli Andreae*, published by Max Bonnet in 1894 and called by him *Narratio*.¹⁰³ In it the anonymous author states (chap. 8) that

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, cols. 1127C, 1134B,D,E.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 13, cols. 208E, 209A.

¹⁰³ In *Analecta Bollandiana*, 13 (1894), pp. 253-372, reprinted in his *Supplementum codicis apocryphi* (Paris, 1895), pp. 45-64. Cf. also R. A. Lipsius, M. Bonnet, *Acta apostolorum apocrypha*, 2 (Leipzig, 1898), p. xvi. The text in *AnBoll.*, p. 358, in *Supplementum*, chap. 8, p. 50: 'Εκεῖθεν τε αὐθις ἐξελθὼν διὰ τοῦ κατάπλου τοῦ αὐτοῦ Εὐξείνου πόντου τοῦ εἰσρέοντος πρὸς τὸ Βυζάντιον δεξιοῖς μέρεσιν ἐχώρει. Καὶ πρὸς τινὰ χώραν καλουμένην Ἀργυρόπολιν καταλαβὼν καὶ ἐκεῖσε ἐκκλησίαν δειμάμενος τὸν ἕνα τῶν ἑβδομήκοντα μαθητῶν

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

Andrew, "after having sailed down through the same *Pontus Euxeinus* [Black Sea] which flows toward Byzantium, landed on the right bank, and after arriving at a place called Argyropolis, and having constructed there a church, he ordained one of the seventy disciples called Stachys whom also Paul the Apostle, the mouth-piece of Christ, the vessel of election, mentions in the Epistle to the Romans [Rom. 16:9] as beloved [by him], Bishop of Byzantium, and left him to preach the word of salvation. He, because of the pagan godlessness that prevailed in that region, and the cruelty of the tyrant Zeuxippus, a worshipper of idols, who held sway there, turned toward western parts (αὐτὸς πρὸς τοῖς δυτικοῖς μέρεσιν ἀπήει), illuminating with his divine teaching the darkness of the West (τὴν δυτικὴν ἀμαυρότητα) [chap. 9]. After wandering through Thessaly and Hellas and after affirming in their cities the mystery of Christ's salvation, he came to Achaea."

It seems clear from this description that, according to the author of the *Narratio*, Thessaly, Hellas, and Achaea belonged to the western parts illuminated by the preaching of Andrew. Actually, with Macedonia and Epirus, they formed part of Illyricum which was subject to the western patriarchate of Rome, and thus could be termed "western parts"—τὰ δυτικὰ μέρη. This indicates that this description of Andrew's activity must have been compiled at a time when Illyricum was not subject to the patriarchs of Constantinople. Some think¹⁰⁴ that the date of this transformation—attributed to Leo III—should be moved from 733 to about 752–757. If this

Στάχυν ὀνόματι, οὗ καὶ Παῦλος ὁ ἀπόστολος, τὸ στόμα Χριστοῦ, τὸ σκεῦος τῆς ἐκλογῆς, ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους μένηται ἐπιστολῇ ἀγαπητὸν αὐτὸν ὄντα χειροτονήσας τοῦ Βυζαντίου ἐπίσκοπον καὶ καταλιπὼν διαγγέλει τὸν σωτήριον λόγον, διὰ τὴν ἐκεῖσε επικρατοῦσαν τότε εἰδωλικὴν ἀθεότητα καὶ τὴν τοῦ τυράννου καὶ εἰδωλομανοῦς Ζευξίππου ὀμότητα τοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ προκαθεζομένου αὐτὸς πρὸς τοῖς δυτικοῖς μέρεσιν ἀπήει, καταφωτίζων ταῖς ἐνθέοις αὐτοῦ διδασκαίς καὶ τὴν δυτικὴν ἀμαυρότητα. Chap. 9: Διελθὼν τε τὴν Θεσσαλίαν καὶ Ἑλλάδα καὶ τοὺς ἐν αὐταῖς ταῖς πόλεσιν τὸ τῆς οἰκονομίας Χριστοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ μυστήριον ἐκθέμενος αὐτόθεν μέτεισιν πρὸς τὴν Ἀχαΐαν.

¹⁰⁴ See V. Grumel, "L'annexion de l'Illyricum oriental, de la Sicile et de la Calabre au patriarcat de Constantinople," *Recherches de science religieuse* (Mélanges Lebreton), 40 (1952), pp. 191–200. Grumel's arguments are, however, far from convincing, as was shown by M. Anastos in his study: "The Transfer of Illyricum to the Jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople in 732," *Silloge Bizantina in honore di S. G. Mercati* (Studi bizantini e neoellenici, 9 [1957]).

BIRTH OF THE ANDREW TRADITION

interpretation is justified,¹⁰⁵ the composition of this document should be allocated before the year 733, perhaps in 757 or, at the latest, very soon after this date, when the new situation had not yet been fully accepted. In any case, it can hardly be supposed that these provinces would have been called "western" at the beginning of the ninth century. In fact the decree of the iconoclastic Emperor was very welcome to all Byzantines, iconoclastic and orthodox alike, and the *Tacticon*, dating from the patriarchate of St. Nicephorus—about the year 810—included the metropolitan of Illyricum among the ecclesiastical provinces under the jurisdiction of Byzantium. So also did another list of sees compiled by Basil the Armenian about the year 829, at the end of the reign of Michael II or at the beginning of the reign of Theophilus.¹⁰⁶

The *Narratio* is probably not the first document to have codified the Andrew tradition concerning Byzantium. There is a work which apparently preceded all others of this kind: the *Index apostolorum discipulorumque Domini Epiphania attributus*.¹⁰⁷ This text was erroneously regarded by R. A. Lipsius¹⁰⁸ as the first re-edition of Pseudo-Dorotheus. Th. Schermann has convincingly shown, however, that it is an independent work, attributed, in the best manuscript containing it (*Parisinus Graecus 1115*), to Epiphanius of Cyprus.

Here a very short and simple version of the story of Byzantium's apostolic foundation is given. In his description of Andrew's missionary activities, the compiler says nothing of the Apostle's

¹⁰⁵ This date was also tentatively suggested and rejected by J. Flamion in his study *Les Actes apocryphes de l'Apôtre André* (Louvain, Paris, Brussels, 1911), pp. 68, 69, because he was under the influence of M. Schermann's dating of Pseudo-Dorotheus at the beginning of the ninth century, and thought that the author of the *Narratio* had used the text of Pseudo-Dorotheus.

¹⁰⁶ See G. Parthey, *Hieroclis synecdomus et notitiae episcopatum* (Berlin, 1866), *notitia* 8, pp. 162–180, *notitiae* 6 and 9, pp. 145–149, 181–197, and H. Gelzer, *Georgii Cyprii descriptio orbis romani* (Leipzig, 1890), pp. xiii–xv, 1–27. Cf. also J. Pargoire, *L'Eglise byzantine de 527 à 847* (2nd ed., Paris, 1923), p. 298.

¹⁰⁷ *Prophetarum vitae fabulosae, indices apostolorum discipulorumque Domini, Dorotheo, Epiphania, Hippolyto aliisque vindicata*, ed. Th. Schermann, Teubner series (Leipzig, 1907), pp. xxxiv seq., 107–126.

¹⁰⁸ *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden*, 1 (Brunswick, 1883), pp. 23, 194 seq.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

stay in Thrace. He merely reports:¹⁰⁹ "Andrew, his [Peter's] brother, as our ancestors have transmitted to us, preached to the Scythians and Sogdianians and Gorsinians, and in Sebastopolis the Great, where are the encampment of Apsarus¹¹⁰ and the Bay of Hyssus and the River Phasis, beyond which live the Ethiopians;¹¹¹ he is buried in Patras of Achaea after having been put on the cross by Aegeus the King of Patras."

If this statement is compared to that of the *Narratio*, it will be seen that the two documents give identical descriptions of Andrew's preaching in Scythia, in Sebastopolis, and at the mouth of the

¹⁰⁹ *Prophetarum Vitae*, ed. Th. Schermann, pp. 108 seq.

¹¹⁰ R. A. Lipsius, *Die apokryphen*, 2, pt. 2, p. 430, proposed the following translation: "Der Garnisonsort Apsaros." On these nations see pp. 208 seq.

¹¹¹ The mention of Ethiopians, designated sometimes as "Ethiopians of the interior," in these geographical regions is puzzling. Perhaps we could see in this the fusion of two traditions; that of Andrew whose activity was generally primarily limited to *Pontus Euxeinus* from where he had reached Byzantium and Achaea, and that of Matthew who, according to the *Martyrium Matthaei*, of Ethiopian origin, originally in Greek and preserved in Latin translation in the so-called Abdias Collection (J.A. Fabricius, *Acta apostolorum apocrypha, sive historia certaminis apostolici, adscripta Abdiae, Babyloniae episcopo*, 2, pp. 636 seq.), had preached in Ethiopia. This *Martyrium* was composed in Ethiopia after 524 (R. A. Lipsius, *op. cit.*, 1, pp. 168, 223, pt. 2, pp. 135-141), and so was certainly known in Byzantium in the seventh and eighth centuries. Matthew was often confounded with Matthias (cf. R. A. Lipsius, M. Bonnet, *loc. cit.*, 1, pt. 1, p. xxxiv). Because the Acts of Andrew and Matthias which spoke about the common activity of both Apostles in the city of the cannibals were read also in Byzantium (they were composed, as we shall see, at the end of the fourth century—probably in Egypt), it may be permissible to suppose that the author of the catalogue of the apostles and disciples, anxious to reconcile the two traditions, had invented the existence of Ethiopians in the Hinterland of the Colchis. In reality the monk Epiphanius, of the ninth century (*Vita S. Andreae*, PG, 120, cols. 225 seq.), speaks of Matthias' and Andrew's preaching there. It is possible that this operation was facilitated by the stories which could be read in Herodotus. In his History (2, chaps. 103, 104; ed. A. D. Godley, 1 [Loeb Classical Library, 1931], pp. 390 seq.) Herodotus describes the military success of the Egyptian King Sesostris who is said to have extended his rule through Asia Minor over the Scythians and Thracians. When returning home from his expedition he is said to have left part of his army in Colchis, on the river Phasis. The Colchians, therefore, affirms Herodotus, are Egyptians. Further (2, chap. 110, *ed. cit.*, 1, p. 398), Herodotus says that Sesostris was the only Egyptian ruler who had succeeded in subduing Ethiopia, which suggests that Ethiopians were among the Egyptian soldiers who had settled on the Phasis. In reality, Herodotus speaks of Ethiopians of Asia (3, chap. 94, *ed. cit.*, 2, p. 122) when enumerating the nations paying tribute to Darius, but he places them in the seventeenth province, together with the Paricanii, on the coast of the Erythrean Sea, in or near Beluchistan. They are also enumerated by Herodotus among the nations whose soldiers composed the army of Xerxes (7, chap. 70, *ed. cit.*, 3, p. 382), and are called Ethiopians of the East, or of Asia.

BIRTH OF THE ANDREW TRADITION

rivers Apsarus and Phasis. The author of the *Narratio* adds a description of how Andrew reached Scythia: He started preaching in Bithynia, visited Nicaea, went from there to Thrace and thence to Scythia. In his account of the Apostle's return journey from Scythia to Thrace, he neglects to mention the Sogdianians and the Gorsinians, and contents himself with calling the people beyond these places Ethiopians.¹¹² He has Andrew proceed from the land of the Ethiopians to Sinope, and from Sinope to Byzantium.

Pseudo-Epiphanius is also brief in speaking of the apostolic foundation of the see of Constantinople. In his list of the disciples the following statement is made concerning Stachys: "Stachys, whom Paul also mentions in the same Epistle [Rom. 6:9], was instituted first Bishop of Byzantium by Andrew the Apostle, in Argyropolis of Thrace."

The conciseness of this information indicates that the Pseudo-Epiphanius contains the first known version, in its simplest and earliest form, of the Andrew and Stachys Legend concerning Byzantium. The *Narratio* gives a more elaborate account of Andrew's travels. It is thus possible to regard the writing of Pseudo-Epiphanius as earlier than the *Narratio*.

Next arises the question of the possible date of the composition of Pseudo-Epiphanius' catalogue. The attribution of this catalogue to Epiphanius of Cyprus, who died in 402, is, of course, incorrect. He is believed, however, to have composed a catalogue of prophets,¹¹³ and this may explain why other similar writings—the catalogues of apostles and of disciples—were attributed to him. It seems probable that these two catalogues circulated anonymously at first, were added later to the catalogue of prophets composed by Epiphanius, and so were finally attributed to him.¹¹⁴

Such an attribution was certainly accepted at the beginning of the ninth century. The monk Epiphanius who wrote¹¹⁵ a Life of

¹¹² Ed. M. Bonnet, *op. cit.*, chaps. 4, 5, pp. 48 seq.

¹¹³ On Epiphanius of Cyprus' authorship of a catalogue of prophets see Th. Schermann, *Prophet. und Apostel.*, pp. 2-6. Moreover, in his *Adversus Haereses* (chaps. 20, 4; 51, 6; PG, 41, cols. 277D, 897 seq.) Epiphanius quotes some names of disciples. This may be another reason why an anonymous catalogue of disciples was attributed to him.

¹¹⁴ Cf. Th. Schermann, *ibid.*, p. 350.

¹¹⁵ For further details see *infra*, p. 178.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

Andrew during the first half of the ninth century, discloses that, in collecting material for his work, he had at hand a composition by Epiphanius of Cyprus on the apostles and the seventy disciples, including the story of Andrew's travels and stay in Byzantium.

But it is possible to reach a more precise conclusion. The two catalogues—or at least the list of disciples—could not have existed in the middle of the seventh century. This is indicated by the way in which the anonymous author of the *Chronicon Paschale* treats the problem of the fate of Christ's disciples. Instead of availing himself of the generous amount of data concerning the disciples supplied by Pseudo-Epiphanius, he refers his readers to a work of Clement of Alexandria, the *Hypotyposis*, shown above to have been very fragmentary and incomplete.¹¹⁶

The author of the *Chronicon* knew only a very simple list of apostles and disciples, which must have been circulating at that time in Byzantium and which he copied.¹¹⁷ This catalogue was probably founded on Clement's *Hypotyposis* and Eusebius' Church History, for it begins with the same names mentioned in these writings.¹¹⁸ In the catalogue of the *Chronicon Paschale* the names of Christ's remaining disciples are compiled from names of persons contained in Paul's letter (Rom. 16, I Cor., Col., II Tim., Titus, Philemon., II Cor.) and in the Acts of the Apostles.¹¹⁹

All of this calls for a short recapitulation of what is known on the origins of detailed lists of Christ's disciples. It is agreed among specialists that the origin of the catalogues of apostles should be sought in Egypt and Syria.¹²⁰ The more or less legendary accounts of the apostles' missionary activities, based on short notices preserved in early Christian writings, also originated in these countries, and from there were introduced into Byzantine ecclesiastical circles where they were often adapted to local traditions.

¹¹⁶ *Chron. Paschale*, ed. Bonn., p. 421. Cf. *supra*, p. 165.

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 400–403.

¹¹⁸ The catalogue starts with the names of Matthias, Sosthenes, and Cephas, all three of these disciples being mentioned in Eusebius' Church History (I, chap. 12, PG, 20, col. 117; GCS, 9, pt. 1, ed. E. Schwartz [1903], p. 80).

¹¹⁹ For a detailed description see Th. Schermann, *op. cit.*, pp. 299 seq.

¹²⁰ Cf. R. A. Lipsius, *Die apokryphen*, I, p. 200, and especially Th. Schermann, *op. cit.*, pp. 204–216.

BIRTH OF THE ANDREW TRADITION

The first attempts to compile a list of Christ's disciples (Luke 10:1) were made by Clement of Alexandria in his lost *Hypotyposis* and by Eusebius in his Church History. They served as a basis for further speculation on the fate of Christ's disciples, and for the composition of more complete lists. Epiphanius of Cyprus (d. 402) quotes the names of only some of Christ's disciples, though he seems to have known the names of all seventy-two.¹²¹

While the apostles were being listed, further progress was being made in Syria in the compilation of lists of Christ's disciples. This is indicated by the list preserved in the Apostolic Constitutions.¹²² Although this catalogue is incomplete, it not only contains the names of the disciples, but reveals a growing interest in their fate. It presents them as bishops instituted in different cities by the apostles.

Such a Syriac list translated into Greek must have been introduced into Byzantium in the second half of the seventh century. It is preserved in two manuscripts. The older manuscript (*Cod. Vat. gr.* 2001, twelfth century) of this "Syriac" catalogue does not contain the stories of Stachys' ordination by Andrew¹²³ or of Andrew's journey through Byzantium; neither do these stories appear in the later manuscript (*Cod. Vat. gr.* 1506, thirteenth century). This catalogue presents the original Syriac tradition, and it must have begun to circulate in Byzantium after the publication of the *Chronicon Paschale*, for the author of the *Chronicon* does not appear to know of the "Syriac" catalogue. Because this catalogue ignores

¹²¹ *Adversus Haereses*, chaps. 20, 4; 51, 6; *PG*, 41, cols. 277D, 897 seq.

¹²² *Didascalia et Constitutiones apostolorum*, I, vii, chap. 46; ed. F. X. Funk, I (Paderborn, 1905), pp. 452 seq.

¹²³ For more details see Th. Schermann, *op. cit.*, pp. 301 seq. The author rightly stresses the fact that in *Vaticanus Graecus* 1506 some names were already listed not according to the Syriac, but according to the Byzantine tradition. Thus it is especially interesting to note that Stachys' story was not added by the translator. In both manuscripts Stachys seems to be listed among the successors to the twelve apostates. Unfortunately folio 80^v of *Vat. gr.* 1506, where Stachys' name should be read, is almost illegible. *Vaticanus graecus* 2001 remarks as follows on Andrew, who is listed after Peter and Paul (fol. 302^v): 'Ἀνδρέας ὁ ἀδελφὸς Σίμωνος Πέτρου, κηρύξας ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι. Εἰς Πάτρας τελειοῦται ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου. In manuscript *Vat. gr.* 1506 (fol. 78) Andrew is listed after Peter, and Hellas is not mentioned: 'Ἀνδρέας Σκύθαις, Ὀγδοανοῖς καὶ Σάκαις. Cf. Th. Schermann, *Prophet. vitae*, pp. 171-177. *Ibid.*, p. 218, a short Syriac list of apostles in Latin translation, probably from the sixth century, which reports merely that Andrew died in Patras.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

the story of Stachys' ordination by Andrew, it must be anterior to the composition of the list erroneously ascribed to Epiphanius of Cyprus.

All of which indicates that the composition of the Pseudo-Epiphanius list should be dated, at the earliest, around the very end of the seventh century, or, more probably, at the beginning of the eighth. Its author simply adapted a Graeco-Syriac list to Byzantine use, often following in his account of the activity of the apostles an older tradition than that he had found in his prototype.¹²⁴ It can be supposed that this catalogue, because of its many details about the further destinies of the disciples, achieved greater popularity than the list of names given by the author of the *Chronicon Paschale*.

Regarding the list of disciples contained in the compilation attributed to Dorotheus of Tyre, it is possible to see in it the final elaboration of a legendary tradition that for some time had been gradually developing in Byzantium. This development was similar to that of the lists attributed to Epiphanius of Cyprus, for here, too, the only part of the compilation that is original is the list of prophets, probably first written in Aramaic and translated or adapted into Greek by the priest Dorotheus. The forger who added to this list of prophets the list of apostles and disciples, and the catalogue of pre-Nicene bishops of Byzantium, promoted the priest Dorotheus to Bishop of Tyre, and had him die a martyr's death under Julian. To add authority to his list of apostles and disciples, the forger inserted a special notice on Dorotheus,¹²⁵ lauding his erudition and attributing to him the translation of Hebrew books into Greek.

It may be that the lists contained in the collection attributed to Dorotheus of Tyre did not appear, at that time, under his name. As to the catalogue of pre-Nicene bishops of Byzantium, the possibility that it was unknown in the Capital City in the eighth century seems confirmed by the oldest *Menologion* of Constantinople, composed in the eighth century, in which there is no mention of

¹²⁴ Cf. L. Duchesne, "Les anciens recueils de légendes apostoliques," *Compte rendu du troisième congrès scientifique international des catholiques*, 1894 (Brussels, 1895), section 5, *Sciences historiques*, p. 77.

¹²⁵ See Th. Schermann, *op. cit.*, pp. 351, 353. Cf. *supra*, p. 156.

BIRTH OF THE ANDREW TRADITION

Stachys or of the twenty-one bishops who are said to have preceded Metrophanes, and who are commemorated on the fourth of June.¹²⁶

Thus the list of bishops of Byzantium was apparently compiled at the end of the eighth century, or at the very beginning of the ninth. This appears to be attested by Theophanes who wrote his Chronicle about 810–811, and who spoke even then of Dorotheus, Bishop of Tyre, mentioning, among his numerous writings, lists of “bishops of Byzantium and of many other places.”¹²⁷

Theophanes, however, does not yet seem to know of a catalogue of apostles and disciples, also ascribed to Dorotheus. This catalogue could, therefore, have been compiled only after 811, and could not have been added to the list of Byzantine bishops until an even later period. This catalogue is, in fact, based on the text of Pseudo-Epiphanius' list, and betrays a further elaboration brought about by the plagiarist. There exists a certain interdependence between the *Narratio* and Pseudo-Dorotheus. J. Flamion¹²⁸ analyzed the similar statements contained in both documents, and concluded that the *Narratio* is later than Pseudo-Dorotheus. The reverse is, however, shown to be probable. The *Narratio* apparently preserves the tradition of Andrew's travels in a purer form than Pseudo-Dorotheus, and its author seems to have used greater logic in his description of Andrew's travels. He has the Apostle go to Byzantium from Sinope and then travel through the “western parts”—Macedonia, Thessaly, and Hellas—to Achaea; whereas Pseudo-Dorotheus writes that Andrew went from Byzantium to Sinope. This makes it difficult to understand how the Apostle reached Achaea which, according to the tradition—also recorded briefly by Pseudo-Dorotheus in his list of apostles—should have been his last missionary territory.

It is, of course, curious to note that the monk Epiphanius, who

¹²⁶ S. A. Morcelli, *Kalendarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, II (Rome, 1788), pp. 119 seq. Cf. K. A. H. Kellner, *Heortologie* (Freiburg i. Br., 1901), p. 220 (2nd ed., [1906], p. 272).

¹²⁷ Theophanes, *Chronographia*, ad. ann. 5816, ed. Bonn, p. 35; ed. de Boor p. 24: οὗτος ἀκριβῶς καὶ περὶ τῶν ἐπισκόπων τοῦ Βυζαντίου καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν τόπων διεξῆλθεν. Cf. Th. Schermann, *op. cit.*, pp. 175 seq., who rightly supposes that Theophanes is using here the same source as Pseudo-Dorotheus, but is more accurate in describing the legendary career of Dorotheus as based on Eusebius' report of the two men with the same name (see *supra*, p. 156).

¹²⁸ *Op. cit.*, pp. 64 seq.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

wrote his *Life of Andrew* after 815, did not know the *Narratio*, but it can perhaps be explained by the outbreak, soon after the *Narratio*'s composition, of the iconoclastic struggles. The violent reaction, under Leo the Armenian, against image-worship hardly favored the spread of hagiographical literature, and so it came about that the *Narratio* fell into oblivion. The iconoclastic troubles may also explain the Byzantines' need to import lists of apostles and disciples from Syria in order to revive their own interest in the fate of Christ's disciples.

The composition of the lists of apostles and disciples contained in Pseudo-Dorotheus should, thus, be dated, at the earliest, around the very end of the eighth century. If, however, the statements of the monk Epiphanius, the author of *Andrew's Life*, concerning his principal source are taken into consideration, this date should be placed even later. To Epiphanius, who wrote his *Life* after 815,¹²⁹ Pseudo-Dorotheus' list was unknown, for he quotes Pseudo-Epiphanius as the main source for his composition. This permits the conclusion that all portions of Pseudo-Dorotheus, as they are now known, were not brought together under the name of that author and circulated throughout Byzantium until about the middle of the ninth century.

Where could the above-mentioned writers have found the basis for their legendary account of Andrew and Stachys? Their main source could only have been a report on Andrew's apostolic activity that must ultimately be traced to the apocrypha generally regarded as of heretical—mostly Gnostic—origin, and which, from the fourth century onward, were often mentioned and rejected by the Church Fathers.¹³⁰

¹²⁹ See *infra*, p. 225.

¹³⁰ Namely by Eusebius, Epiphanius, Philastrius of Brescia, Timotheus of Constantinople, Turibius of Astorga, St. Augustine, Euodius of Uzala. For details and precise quotations see R. A. Lipsius, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 543 seq.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE LEGENDARY ELEMENTS IN THE ANDREW TRADITION

The lost apocryphal Acts of Andrew as the ultimate source of the Constantinopolitan tradition — Gregory of Tours on Andrew's stay in Byzantium — The apocryphal Acts of Andrew known in the East and West from the fifth to the ninth centuries — Date of the composition of the apocryphal Acts of Andrew — Scythia, not Achaea, as Andrew's missionary field — Did Andrew preach in Asia Minor? — The legend of the man eaters as a reflection of the old tradition of Andrew's preaching in Scythia — Later tradition identifying the city of the man eaters with Sinope — The "Scythian tradition" reflected in the original Acts and in the Legends of Andrew's preaching in Colchis and in Georgia — Legendary traits in the "Achaean tradition" — Oldest traditions quote Luke as missionary of Achaea — Spread of the new "Achaean tradition" — Legendary accounts of Argyropolis and Zeuxippus — Probable origin of the "Achaean tradition" — Conclusion.

The apocryphal writings on Andrew must now be searched in order to trace the origin and development of the tradition concerning his activity in Byzantium, and to determine the legendary elements which it contained.

Of the original apocryphal description of Andrew's activity—The Acts or Travels of Andrew—less survives than of similar apocryphal Acts of three other Apostles—John, Paul, and Peter.¹ Only a short text of the original Acts of Andrew seems to be preserved in a Greek manuscript in the Vatican Library.² Fortunately the Acts of Andrew have survived, at least in part, in some western and eastern texts whose authors, using the original Acts,

¹ For more details see I. E. Hennecke, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* (2nd ed., Tübingen, 1924), pp. 163–256.

² It is the *Vaticanus Graecus* 808, published by M. Bonnet in R. A. Lipsius, M. Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum apocrypha*, 2, pt. 1 (Leipzig, 1898), pp. xiv, 38–45.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

based their information on what they found in them, sometimes copying whole passages from these sources.

The western texts are: the Latin letter of the priests and deacons of Achaea describing the martyrdom of Andrew³—also preserved in Greek versions—a Latin passion of the apostle,⁴ and, most important of all, the Book of Miracles of St. Andrew the Apostle, compiled by St. Gregory, Bishop of Tours.⁵

The main Greek texts are the accounts of Andrew's martyrdom, called *Martyrium Andreae Prius* and *Martyrium Andreae alterum*,⁶ the *Acta Andreae et Matthiae*, which exists also in Syriac, Ethiopic, Coptic, Latin, and Anglo-Saxon versions, and the *Acta Petri et Andreae*.⁷

The descriptions of Andrew's martyrdom, although important for attempts at a reconstruction of the original acts of St. Andrew, are of little interest for our investigation.⁸ The Latin letter was composed by an African, who had found refuge in Sardinia, after

³ Ed. M. Bonnet in *Acta Apost. apocr.*, published by Lipsius and Bonnet on the basis of Tischendorf's edition, 2, pt. 1, (Leipzig, 1898), pp. 1-37, with Greek versions.

⁴ Ed. M. Bonnet in *Supplementum codicis apocryphi*, 2. *Acta Andreae* (Paris, 1895), pp. 66-70. The *Passio* starts with the words *Conversante et docente*, by which it is often quoted.

⁵ Ed. M. Bonnet, Gregorius Turonensis Episcopus, *Liber de miraculis beati Andreae Apostoli*, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum*, 1 (1883), pp. 826-846. Cf. *ibid.*, 7 (1919), pp. 707-756, B. Krusch's remarks on Bonnet's edition.

⁶ Ed. M. Bonnet, in R. A. Lipsius, M. Bonnet, *op. cit.*, pp. 46-57, 58-64.

⁷ Ed. M. Bonnet, *ibid.*, pp. 65-127. On the non-Greek versions of the *Acta Andreae et Matthiae* cf. R. A. Lipsius, *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden*, 1, pp. 546 seq. J. Flamion, *Les actes apocryphes de l'Apôtre André* (Louvain-Paris-Brussels, 1911), pp. 310 seq. The Anglo-Saxon version was published by J. Grimm (*Andreas und Elene* [Cassel, 1841]). The Acts of Peter and Andrew are preserved also in an Ethiopian and old Slavonic translation (Lipsius, *ibid.*, p. 554). Cf. also F. Haase, *Apostel und Evangelisten in den orientalischen Überlieferungen* (Münster i. W., 1922), *Neutestam. Abhandlungen*, ed. M. Meinertz, 9, Heft. 1-3, pp. 249-252. C. Schmidt, "Apokryphe koptische Apostelgeschichten und Legenden," in A. von Harnack's *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, 1 (Leipzig, 1893), pp. 919-922; I. Guidi, "Gli Atti Apocrifi degli Apostoli nei testi copti, arabi e etiopici," *Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana*, 2 (1888). M. R. James, *Apocrypha anecdota, Texts and Studies*, 2, no. 3; 5, no. 1 (Cambridge, 1893, 1897); A. S. Lewis "The Mythological Acts of the Apostles" in *Horae Semiticae*, 4 (London, 1904), pp. 1-30, Arabic translations of Andrew texts.

⁸ See the detailed examination of the Greek and Latin descriptions of Andrew's martyrdom and of their relation to the primitive account now lost, in Flamion, *op. cit.*, pp. 89-191.

LEGENDARY ELEMENTS

being exiled by the Vandal King Thrasamond at the beginning of the sixth century. The Latin text of this letter is older than its Greek versions, and even the text of the Latin passion reveals some affinities with the letter, although the author of this passion has also consulted the original Acts of Andrew.⁹

Of the Greek descriptions of Andrew's martyrdom, only the introduction to the *Martyrium prius*—which should very likely be dated from the end of the eighth century—¹⁰ gives any indication of Andrew's missionary activity. From it we learn how Bithynia, Lacedemonia, and Achaea were assigned to Andrew for preaching the Gospel,¹¹ although, in this account, Macedonia should probably be substituted for Lacedemonia. However, in describing Andrew's activity, the author simply dismissed Macedonia, and allowed Andrew to reach Achaia direct from Asia Minor. Neither the Acts of Andrew and Matthew, nor the Acts of Peter and Andrew give any specific information concerning the area of Andrew's activities. The first, however, designates Achaea as Andrew's missionary territory, and reports that Andrew was brought miraculously by Christ Himself acting as pilot, with two angels disguised as sailors, to the city of the anthropophagites—not identified by name—in order to deliver Matthias, who had been imprisoned there and tortured by the natives, from the tragic fate that was awaiting him. The other document describes Peter's and Andrew's preaching in the land of the barbarians, but again without precise geographical designations, although it is full of accounts of fanciful miracles.¹²

For the purpose of the present study the most important of all the Andrew texts just mentioned is the Book of Miracles of St. Andrew. This was written by St. Gregory of Tours toward the end of his life, in 591 or 592.¹³ Gregory discloses in his preface¹⁴ that he had found a book *De virtutibus S. Andreae* which, because of its "verbosity" was regarded by many as apocryphal. From these

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 40 seq.

¹⁰ J. Flamion, *op. cit.*, pp. 61 seq.

¹¹ R. A. Lipsius, M. Bonnet, *op. cit.*, 2, pt. 1, p. 47.

¹² Cf. the analysis of the contents by Lipsius, *Die apokr. Apost.* 1, pp. 550–557. R. A. Lipsius, M. Bonnet, *op. cit.*, 2, pt. 1, pp. 65 seq., 117 seq.

¹³ J. Flamion, *op. cit.*, pp. 50–55.

¹⁴ *MGH, Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum*, 1, p. 827.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

writings he made a selection of Andrew's miracles, and, after purging them of all incongruous additions, incorporated them in his book on Andrew's miracles.

Gregory mentions, again in his preface, a collection of *passiones apostolorum* which was accepted by the Christians of Gaul, and which originated in a Frankish monastery around the middle of the sixth century.¹⁵ After Gregory's death, this collection was enriched by the addition of the "Virtues and Miracles of the Apostles," and was circulated under the name of "Abdias," the supposed Bishop of Babylon.¹⁶ The attribution is, of course, legendary, and the main source of the *Virtutes Andreae et Miracula* added to this collection, as mentioned, was Gregory's writing.¹⁷

In Gregory's composition Andrew is said to have begun his preaching in Achaea, which had been allotted to him before the apostles had separated. On the Lord's order, given by an angel, Andrew sailed from Achaea to the city called Myrmidon, in order to free St. Matthias from the prison into which the inhabitants had thrown him. No mention is made of anthropophagites. When this story is compared with that in the apocryphal Acts of Andrew and Matthias, it is clearly apparent that Gregory of Tours knew of this work, and that this part of his compilation is merely an abridged version of the narrative contained in the Acts.

What follows in Gregory's Miracles of Andrew was taken from another apocryphal writing which could only have been the book *De Virtutibus Andreae* mentioned by Gregory in his preface. Gregory has Andrew, after delivering Matthias from prison, preach

¹⁵ L. Duchesne, "Les anciens recueils de légendes apostoliques," *Compte rendu du troisième congrès scientifique international des catholiques*, 1894 (Brussels, 1895), section 5, *Sciences historiques*, pp. 75 seq. Cf. R. A. Lipsius, *op. cit.*, 1, pp. 165 seq., 557-566.

¹⁶ Published by J. A. Fabricius, *Acta apostolorum apocrypha, sive historia certaminis apostolici, adscripta Abdiae, Babyloniae episcopo*, in his *Codex apocryphus Novi Testamenti*, 2 (Hamburg, 1719), pp. 456-515 (*de gestis beati Andreae apostoli*). The description of Andrew's passion starts on p. 508. On Abdias see Lipsius, *op. cit.*, pp. 117-178.

¹⁷ This collection of *Pseudo-Abdias* seems to have been known to Venantius Fortunatus (d. 609), who apparently quotes it in his poem *De Virginitate* (verses 137 seq., *PL*, 88, col. 270). It was also used by the author of the Auxerre edition of *Martyrium Hieronymianum* at the very end of the sixth century. Cf. G. B de Rossi, L. Duchesne, *Martyrium Hieronymianum*, in *AS*, Nov. 2, pt. 1 (Brussels, 1894), pp. LXXV seq.

LEGENDARY ELEMENTS

to the inhabitants of the city, and then goes on to describe, in great detail, how he journeyed back to his province of Achaea. The Apostle sailed first along the southern coast of the Black Sea, visiting the cities of Amaseia, Sinope, Nicaea, and Nicomedia, performing, of course, numerous miracles all along the way. At Nicomedia he boarded a ship for Byzantium, and on the journey through the Hellespont appeased by his prayers a violent storm which was endangering the safety of his companions.

While journeying from Byzantium through Thrace, Andrew was menaced by a multitude armed with swords, but, after he had implored help from the Lord, an angel appeared and disarmed the hostile crowd. The Apostle then reached Perinthus on the Thracian coast, whence he sailed to Macedonia. He preached and worked miracles in Philippi and in Thessalonica, and finally arrived at Patras in Achaea.¹⁸ In the compilation attributed to Abdias, Andrew's story is copied, with slight differences in style, from Gregory's writings, although Andrew's stay in Byzantium and in Thrace is described as it was by the Bishop of Tours.

For any investigation into the origins of Byzantine tradition concerning the Apostle Andrew it is important to point out that in Gregory's writings, as early as the end of the sixth century, Byzantium and Thrace were mentioned among the places and provinces visited by Andrew, and it is evident from Gregory's introduction to his writings on the Apostle's miracles that the Bishop did not

¹⁸ MGH, *Script. Rer. Merov.*, 1, p. 831. Byzantium and Thrace are mentioned in chaps. 8, 9, and 10. Chap. 8: *Egressus inde apostolus Domini navem conscendit ingressusque Helispontum fretum, navigabat, ut veniret Byzantium. Et ecce commotum est mare, et incubuit super eos ventus validus, et mergebatur navis. Denique, praestolantibus cunctis periculum mortis, oravit beatus Andreas ad Dominum praecipiensque vento, siluit; fluctus autem maris quieverunt, et tranquillitas data est. Ereptique omnes a praesenti discrimine, Byzantium pervenerunt.* Chap. 9: *Inde progressi, ut venirent Thracias, apparuit eis multitudo hominum a longe cum evaginatiis gladiis, lanceas manu gestantes, quasi volentes in illis irruere. Quod cum vidisset Andreas apostolus, faciens crucis signum contra eos, ait: "Oro, Domine, ut decadat pater eorum, qui haec eos agere instigavit. Consturbentur virtute divina, ne noceant sperantes in te." Haec eo dicente angelus Domini cum magno splendore praeteriens, tetigit gladios eorum, et corruerunt proni in terra. Transiensque beatus apostolus cum suis, nihil est nocitus; omnes enim, proiecitis gladiis, adorabant eum. Angelus quoque Domini discessit ab eis cum magno lumine claritatis.* Chap. 10: *Sanctus vero apostolus pervenit ad Perintum civitatem Traciae maritimam et invenit ibi navem quae in Machedoniam properaret....*

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

invent this information. He quotes a work on Andrew's virtues or deeds as his main source. Thus he copied his description of Andrew's travels from this manuscript which was regarded by many as apocryphal, and it is therefore essential to determine whether such a work ever existed, whether it has been known earlier in the West, as well as at the time of Gregory of Tours, and whether it was still in circulation in Byzantium in the seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries.¹⁹ Furthermore, could it have been used by the anonymous authors who, in this period, codified the legendary tradition of the foundation by Andrew of the episcopal see of Byzantium?

Concerning Andrews activities, we still have today the testimony of Eusebius, made known also in the West by Rufinus' translation of Eusebius' Church history. After enumerating the canonical books of the New Testament, Eusebius adds the titles of some writings which were regarded with suspicion by the orthodox;²⁰ the so-called "Acts of Paul," as well as the so-called "Shepherd's Book and the Apocalypse of Peter," the epistle of Barnabas, the so-called "Doctrine of the Apostles," and the Gospel of the Hebrews. Then he continues: "We should know also the writings propagated by the heretics under the names of the apostles, such as [the writings] containing the so-called Gospels of Peter, and Thomas, and Matthias, and similarly of other apostles, or like the Acts of Andrew and John, and the other apostles."

The Acts of Andrew are thus explicitly mentioned and designated as apocryphal writings. It may be that Eusebius already had in mind a *Corpus* of apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, containing the Acts of Peter, John, Andrew, Thomas, and Paul, because he enumerates only these Apostles in the above passage.²¹ Thus it will

¹⁹ Cf. also the short dissertation by F. Piontek, *Die katholische Kirche und die häretischen Apostelgeschichten bis zum Ausgang des 6. Jahrhunderts*, Dissertation (Breslau, 1907), published also in Sdrlek's *Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen*, 6 (Breslau, 1907).

²⁰ *Historia ecclesiastica*, 3, chap. 25; GCS, 9, pt. 2, ed. E. Schwartz (1903), p. 252 (Rufinus, *ibid.*, p. 253); PG, 20, col. 269.

²¹ Cf. C. Schmidt, *Die alten Petrusakten im Zusammenhang mit der apokryphen Apostellitteratur untersucht, Texte und Untersuchungen*, 24, N. F., 9 (Leipzig, 1903), pp. 29 seq. The best study on the Petrine Act is that of J. Flamon, "Les actes apocryphes de Pierre" in *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, 9 (1908), pp. 233-254, 465-490; 10 (1909), pp. 1-29, 245-277; 11 (1910), pp. 5-28, 233-256, 447-470, 675-692; 12 (1911), pp. 209-230.

LEGENDARY ELEMENTS

be seen that some heretics were using this *Corpus* of apocryphal Acts instead of the canonical Acts of the Apostles.

The use of the apocryphal Acts of the Apostles by the heretics for the same period in the fourth century is attested to by Epiphanius.²² He might have in mind the same collection of apocryphal Acts as Eusebius, although he mentions, in one instance only, the Acts of Andrew and Thomas, and in another those "of Andrew and the others."

This, however, does not mean, *a priori*, that all these Acts were composed by heretics, although they contained encratic views in ascetic practice and other passages which could be used by heretics—Gnostics, Manichaeans, and Priscillianists—as confirming their doctrines on those matters.

These apocryphal Acts were soon circulating also, in Latin translations, in the West, where they were propagated principally by the Manichaeans and later by the Priscillianists, but where they were read, too, by Catholics. The use of these apocryphal writings in the West is first attested by Philastrius, Bishop of Brescia, who was probably of Egyptian origin. In his description, written about 383 or 384,²³ of different heresies known to him, Philastrius enumerates the canonical books of both Testaments, urging that care be taken in reading apocryphal books because of their having been altered by heretics. He does not forbid such reading, but only advises readers to be cautious in using the books and to beware the dangerous ideas that had been insinuated into them. He mentions the Acts of Andrew, John, Peter, and Paul, and, although he does not single out the Acts of Thomas, it may be presumed that he had in mind the same *Corpus* of the Acts to which Eusebius seems to be alluding. The Acts of Andrew were an integral part of the *Corpus*.

²² *Adversus Haereses*, chaps. 47, 1; 61, 1; 63, 2; GCS, 31, ed. K. Holl (1922), pp. 216, 381, 399; PG, 41, cols. 852, 1040, 1064.

²³ Philastrius, *Diversarum hereseon liber*, CSEL, 38, ed. F. Marx (1898), chap. 61 (old editions, chap. 88), p. 48; PL, 12, col. 1200. Cf. also Fabricius, *op. cit.*, 2, p. 751: *Scripturae autem absconditae, id est apocrypha, etsi legi debent morum causa a perfectis, non ab omnibus debent quia non intelligentes multa addiderunt et tulerunt quae voluerunt heretici: Nam Manichei apocrypha beati Andreae apostoli, id est Actus quos fecit veniens de Ponto in Greciam quos conscripserunt tunc discipuli sequentes beatum apostolum, unde et habent Manichei et alii tales Andreae beati et Joannis Actus evangelistae beati, et Petri similiter beatissimi apostoli, et Pauli pariter beati apostoli. . . .*

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

For this investigation Philastrius' views on the Acts of Andrew are particularly important. He says that the Acts described Andrew's deeds while journeying from Pontus to Greece. In Gregory's *Miracles of St. Andrew* the Apostle's travels are depicted in the same way, for there he is said to have started his journey to Greece from Amaseia and Sinope in Pontus.

Thus we may surmise that Philastrius had in mind the work that Gregory called *Liber ed virtutibus Andreae* and that this work was a Latin translation of the original apocryphal Acts, which have been shown to have formed a part of the *Corpus* of the five apocryphal Acts of the Apostles.

If this is true, the work mentioned by Philastrius must have included Byzantium among the places in Thrace visited by Andrew on his journey from Pontus to Greece, as do the *Virtutes Andreae* by Gregory, who had made an abridged and expurgated edition of the original Acts translated into Latin.

In the fifth century the Acts of Andrew, in their original form, circulated also in the West. This is confirmed, first of all by Pope Innocent I (402-417). In his letter to the Bishop of Toulouse,²⁴ the Pope attributes the composition of the Acts of Matthew, James, Peter, and John to Leucius, and of the Acts of Andrew—if this passage is authentic—to the philosophers Nexocharides and Leonides. The Pope seems here to have in mind the same Acts as Eusebius.

The letter of Turibius, a contemporary of Leo the Great (440-461), to Hydacius and Ceponius also warns the faithful against reading the Acts of Andrew.²⁵ In the Prologue of Pseudo-Mellitus to the Passion of St. John the Evangelist²⁶ the composition of the Acts of Andrew is attributed to Leucius. The same attribution is made

²⁴ *PL*, 20, col. 502. See R. A. Lipsius, *op. cit.*, 2, pt. 2, p. 430, and I. E. Hennecke, *Handbuch zu den neutestamentlichen Apokryphen* (Tübingen, 1904), p. 546. Cf. J. Flamion, *Les Actes d'André*, p. 263, footnote 1 on this attribution. It is possible that these two were mentioned in the original Acts among the names of the pagans converted by Andrew and that, in some circles, they were regarded as authors of the Acts.

²⁵ *PL*, 54, col. 694C: *specialiter autem Actus illos qui vocantur S. Andreae.*

²⁶ Fabricius, *op. cit.*, 3, p. 604: *volo solititatem esse fraternitatem vestram de Leucio quodam, qui scripsit Apostolorum Acta Joannis Evangelistae, et Sancti Andreae, vel Thomae Apostoli. Quaedam de virtutibus quidem quae per eos Dominus fecit, vera dixit; de doctrina vero multa mentitus est.* . . . The last sentence recalls what Gregory says in his preface on the work *De Virtutibus Andreae*.

LEGENDARY ELEMENTS

by Evodius, a contemporary of St. Augustine, in his treatise against the Manichaeans.²⁷

A study of allusions to the apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, found in Augustine's works, ²⁸ has shown that the Manichaeans of North Africa and the Priscillianists of Spain were in possession of a *Corpus* of Acts of the Apostles containing the Acts of Peter, Andrew, Thomas, John, and Paul. They held this *Corpus* in high esteem, and regarded it as belonging to the canonical Holy Books of the New Testament, replacing the Acts of the Apostles considered canonical by the Catholics. It appears that Augustine and his Manichaean adversaries still regarded this *Corpus* as anonymous, although Augustine himself mentioned the name of Leucius in one of his works.²⁹

All of this evidence confirms that the Acts of Andrew, although regarded by many as apocryphal and heretical, were well-known in the West in the fifth and sixth centuries and that the work was easily accessible to Gregory of Tours. Although no direct proof is extant, it can safely be assumed that Gregory made an extract from the same work as that quoted in previous testimonies.^{29a}

There is no direct evidence to show that the original Acts of Andrew circulated in Byzantium during the fifth and sixth centuries, but it is reasonable to presume that the apocryphal Acts of the Apostles were known in Byzantium during this period. That this was the case is indicated by the sixth-century chronicler Malalas,³⁰

²⁷ Enodius Uzalensis, *De fide contra Manichaeos*, chap. 38, CSEL, 25, ed. J. Zycha (1891), pp. 968 seq. Cf. J. Flamion, *op. cit.*, p. 188.

²⁸ To record these allusions a survey of Augustine's works was made by C. Schmidt, *op. cit.*, pp. 44, 52. The most important passage for the Acts of Andrew is to be found in Augustine's *Contra Faustum Manichaeum*, 14, chap. 1, 30, chap. 4; CSEL, 25, ed. J. Zycha (1891), pp. 402, 751.

²⁹ *Contra Felicem*, 2, chap. 6; *ibid.*, p. 833. J. Flamion (*op. cit.*, pp. 189 seq.) thinks, in contradiction to C. Schmidt (*op. cit.*, p. 50), that even in this passage Augustine had the Acts of Andrew in mind.

^{29a} It is important to note that the Manichaean Psalm-book mentions the same episode described by Gregory in chapter 12 of his book on Andrew's miracles (*op. cit.*, p. 832), namely the burning of the house in Thessalonica in which Andrew's disciple stayed (C. R. C. Alberry, *A Manichaean Psalm-book: Manichaean Manuscripts in the Chester Beatty Collection*, 2 [Stuttgart, 1938], p. 142). This is an additional indication that Gregory very probably had at hand the same Acts of Andrew as those used by the Manichaeans and other heretics.

³⁰ Ed. Bonn, pp. 252 seq. See in C. Schmidt, *op. cit.*, pp. 64, 65, the discussion of allusions to Acts of Apostles in the works of Epiphanius, Theodoret, and Amphilochius. Andrew's Acts are not specifically mentioned.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

who had copied in his account of St. Peter, a part of the apocryphal Acts of this Apostle and seems to have adapted them to his own taste.

From the end of the seventh century the testimony of John of Thessalonica is available. In the preface to his new edition of a work describing the Blessed Virgin's death, John emphasizes the desirability of concentrating on re-editing pious writings which, though originally orthodox, had been disfigured by fanciful additions and changes contrived by the heretics who had used them. He does this for the works on the Virgin Mary's death, and by so doing follows the example of others who had recently done likewise with regard to works on the travels of Peter, Paul, Andrew, and John.³¹ Although there is no evidence that the Acts of Andrew had been so treated, it can clearly be seen from what John says that Andrew's Acts were known and read in Byzantium in John's time, but were looked upon with suspicion.

With regard to the ninth century, we may quote George the Monk, who had also copied a passage from the Acts of St. Peter³² in his *World Chronicle*, composed in the reign of Michael III, and who may have copied his passage from Malalas. But another important witness is available for this century—the Patriarch Photius. He testifies in his *Bibliotheca*³³ that the "Travels of Andrew"

³¹ M. Bonnet, "Bemerkungen über die ältesten Schriften von der Himmelfahrt Mariae," in *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 23 (1880), p. 239: οὕτω γὰρ εὗρήκαμεν χρησαμένους καὶ τοὺς ἑναγχοῦς ἡμᾶς προηγησαμένους καὶ τοὺς πολλῶν πρὸ αὐτῶν ἁγίους πατέρας, τοὺς μὲν περὶ τὰς καλουμένας ἱδικὰς περιόδους τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου καὶ Ἀνδρέου καὶ Ἰωάννου, τοὺς δὲ περὶ τὰ πλείστα τῶν χριστοφόρων μαρτύρων συγγράμματα.

L. Vouaux, *Les actes de Pierre et ses lettres apocryphes* (Paris, 1922), p. 191, suggested that John of Thessalonica had in mind the attempts made by Malalas and Pseudo-Marcellus to purify the Acts of Peter (*ibid.* pp. 186 seq.). Let us not forget that, as mentioned before (p. 183), the *Martyrium Prius* was written in the eighth century and is based on the original Acts.

³² Bk. 3, chap. 21; ed. E. G. von Muralt (St. Petersburg, 1859), pp. 269 seq.; *PG*, 110, cols. 428 seq.; ed. de Boor, 1 (Leipzig, 1904), pp. 364 seq.

³³ *PG*, 103, *Cod.* 114, col. 389: Ἀνεγνώσθη βιβλίον, αἱ λεγόμεναι τῶν Ἀποστόλων Περίοδοι, ἐν αἷς περιείχοντο πράξεις Πέτρου, Ἰωάννου, Ἀνδρέου, Θωμᾶ, Παύλου. Γράφει δὲ αὐτάς, ὡς δηλοῖ τὸ αὐτὸ βιβλίον, Λεύκιος Χαρίνος. Cf. also *Cod.* 179, col. 524D. See the thorough examination of these passages by Schmidt, *op. cit.*, pp. 67–75, who tries to show that Photius cannot have studied the *Corpus* of Acts thoroughly, and might have attributed its authorship to Leucius, although the latter's name was mentioned only in the Acts of John. Schmidt thinks that Photius might have contented himself with the lecture of the Acts of Peter and John, the first part of the *Corpus*. L. Vouaux, *Les Actes*

LEGENDARY ELEMENTS

which were a part of the "Travels of the Apostles"—a clear allusion to the *Corpus* of the Acts of the Apostles mentioned above—were known and read at this time. This is important, for it shows that the authors of the Byzantine Andrew texts, under examination here, had easy access to the apocryphal writings on the Apostle Andrew, and could have found in them the basis for the creation of their story on Andrew's activity in Byzantium.

Before drawing conclusions from these findings, an attempt must be made to determine the most probable date of composition of the original apocryphal Acts of Andrew. This is essential to tracing the origin and development of the Andrew Legend. It is well known that, although the dates of the composition of the apocryphal Acts of John (about the middle of the second century), of Peter (about 180–190), of Paul (about the year 200),^{33a} and of Thomas (third century) are generally agreed upon among specialists, the date of the composition of the Acts of Andrew is still subject to controversy. If these Acts were really composed by heretics—Gnostics or Manichaeans—they must have originated, if not in the second century, then, at least, at the beginning of the third. The fact that the Fathers testify unanimously that these Acts were used and highly valued by heretics seems to favor the conclusion that Andrew's Acts owe their origin to the Gnostics or Manichaeans.

Such is also the judgement of Lipsius,³⁴ the foremost specialist in this kind of apocryphal literature. After a minute analysis of all available Andrew texts, he concluded that all of them are directly, or indirectly, derived from the original Acts or Travels of the

de Paul (Paris, 1913), pp. 61 seq., thinks that Photius had at hand a copy of the *Corpus* of Acts which had been doctored by heretics. However, the accounts of many unlikely miracles and of numerous visions of the Lord in various manifestations described in the Acts as we know them, as well as their strong encratite character, would have justified Photius in rejecting them as unorthodox fables. As for Leucius, it is interesting to note that Pacianus, Bishop of Barcelona (d. bet. 379–392), in a letter against the Novations, numbered him among the teachers of the heretics (Pacianus, *Epistolae tres*; 1, *PL*, 13, col. 1053B).

^{33a} Concerning the dating of *Acta Petri* and *Acta Pauli* see C. Schmidt, *Acta Pauli nach dem Papyrus der Hamburger Staats-und Universitätsbibliothek* (Hamburg-Glückstadt, 1936), pp. 127 seq.

³⁴ *Op. cit.*, 1, pp. 586 seq.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

Apostles which were composed by Gnostic writers. He thought that he had discovered in them slight traces of Gnostic doctrines that had escaped the scrutiny of both their Catholic censors and their editors. He believed that the strongest arguments for his thesis of the Gnostic origin of Andrew's Acts lay in the two fragments quoted from them by Evodius, and in the third fragment preserved in the work *De vera et falsa poenitentia*,³⁵ falsely attributed to St. Augustine. On this basis he thought that the origin of Andrew's Acts or Travels should be dated in the same period as that of Peter's and John's Acts or Travels, namely, in the second part of the second century.

Lipsius' thesis still has many supporters, although it has been thoroughly re-examined and criticized by J. Flamion,³⁶ who undertook the painstaking task of reconstructing the original Acts of Andrew from the material contained in Latin and Greek Andrew texts, all of which must ultimately derive, in one way or another, from the original composition. Contrary to Lipsius' belief, he found that the original Acts were not Gnostic, but were written by an orthodox writer who was strongly influenced by neopythagorism and, even more, by neoplatonism. The ideas which are regarded by Lipsius as Gnostic can be explained and understood in the light of strong encratite tendencies, not uncommon in the early Church and also manifested by the author of the Acts. This encratite tendency is particularly apparent in the description of the Apostle's martyrdom.

The account of Andrew's martyrdom formed the second part of the original Acts. The first part, describing Andrew's travels and preaching, is reflected in the work of Gregory of Tours, which is really an expurgated, abridged, and corrected edition of the original Acts. Gregory did not dwell on the Apostle's passion, because someone else had made a similar revision of the description of Andrew's

³⁵ *PL*, 40, chap. 8, 22, cols. 1120 seq. The treatise seems, however, of too recent a date—ninth to eleventh century—to be of use in this respect. Cf. J. Flamion, *op. cit.*, p. 191.

³⁶ *Op. cit.*, pp. 89–263. A résumé of this important study, by H. Coppieters, will be found in *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, 13 (1912), pp. 325–332. A. von Harnack had already expressed his doubts about the Gnostic character of passages quoted by Lipsius. Von Harnack thought that the original Acts were re-edited in an expurgated catholic version in the post-Constantinian period (*Geschichte der alichristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*, 2 [Leipzig, 1897], pp. 543 seq.)

LEGENDARY ELEMENTS

martyrdom in Latin, and the Bishop of Tours had at hand the result of this revision: the Latin martyrdom *Conversante et docente*.

In Flamion's opinion, the original Acts of Andrew were written in Greek in Achaëa. This is indicated by an almost exclusive use of Hellenic names by the author and by the style of the whole composition which is intimately related to the style of Greek romances.³⁷ They were written by an intellectual Greek, who was an orthodox Christian with tendencies toward excessive asceticism, who was fond of Greek rhetoric, and who was influenced by philosophic traits which were in vogue at this period. The composition should be dated from the second half of the third century, a time when neopythagorism and especially neoplatonism were capturing the minds of many.

Gregory must also have known the Acts of Andrew and Matthias, because, as already mentioned, at the beginning of his Book on Andrew's miracles he summarized their fantastic account in a very condensed form. A Latin translation of these Acts actually existed in Gregory's time, for not only fragments, but also two independent redactions of it have since been found.³⁸ Holding a contrary opinion to that of Lipsius, Flamion thinks that the Acts of Andrew and Matthias, together with the Acts of Peter and Andrew, did not form part of the original Acts of Andrew. Some characteristic features which the two compilations present, i.e. a talking sphinx, mention of Ethiopians, a predilection for psalmody and liturgy, the prominence given to monachism, etc., would seem to indicate that the two Acts originated in Egypt where monachism was strong, and that they were written about the year 400 by an Egyptian monk, who was well-versed in the Greek language. Since the teaching is orthodox, they may represent the reaction against apocrypha and its heretical tendencies, which was condemned by Athanasius in 367.³⁹

³⁷ See in this respect the interesting study by Rosa Röder, "Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und die romanhafte Literatur der Antike," *Würzburger Studien zur Altertumswissenschaft*, 3 (Stuttgart, 1932).

³⁸ Cf. R. A. Lipsius, M. Bonnet, *op. cit.*, 2, pt. 1, p. XXI, and F. Blatt, *Die lateinischen Bearbeitungen der Acta Andreae et Matthiae apud anthropophagos* (Giessen, 1930).

³⁹ J. Flamion, *op. cit.*, pp. 310-319. See Athanasius' Easter letter 39 from 367 (PG. 26, cols. 1436-1440) in which the Bishop reviews canonical and non-canonical books. Cf. *infra*, p. 202, for this author's thoughts on Flamion's theory concerning the origin of the Acts of Andrew and Matthias.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

E. Hennecke⁴⁰ gave vent to doubts concerning some of Flamion's findings. He was loath to share Flamion's appreciation of Gregory's work for the reconstruction of the original Acts, and hesitated to admit the existence of neoplatonic tendencies in the Greek *Martyria*. For this reason his proposed reconstruction of the Acts is extremely fragmentary and limited mostly to the events in Patras, which are described also in the short text preserved in *Vaticanus Graecus* 808, regarded by him as the only genuine part of the original Acts preserved down to our time. B. Pick followed Hennecke's suggestions, and limited himself in his reconstructions to Andrew's passion only.⁴¹

Hennecke's disciple, M. Blumenthal,⁴² seems to have been well aware of this disadvantage, and tried to reconstruct the original Acts by using the Acts of Andrew and Matthias, those of Peter and Andrew, the *Narratio*, the work of the monk Epiphanius, and the *Laudatio*, the two latter compositions dating from the ninth century. The result is not much more satisfactory than the work of Hennecke himself, for Gregory's *Miracula* were completely left out in the reconstruction. Both specialists neglected the testimony of Philastrius of Brescia, who knew of a work called "the Deeds of Andrew," which described the Apostle's exploits on the way from Pontus to Greece. As mentioned before, Gregory also described Andrew's travels and deeds from Pontus to Greece, and his description, although abridged and expurgated, is of the utmost importance for the reconstruction of the original Acts.

On the whole, Flamion's findings concerning the Acts of Andrew were not disproved by his critics, and were accepted by the English specialist in apocryphal literature, M. R. James.⁴³

⁴⁰ Cf. his short review of Flamion's work in *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 38 (1913), cols. 73, 74. For more details see his *Neutest. Apokr.* (2nd ed., 1924), p. 250. He expressed the same scepticism, without giving any convincing argument, in his short review "Zur christlichen Apokryphenliteratur," in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 45 (1926), p. 313.

⁴¹ B. Pick, *The Apocryphal Acts of Paul, Peter, John, Andrew, and Thomas* (Chicago, 1909), pp. 200-221. The author uses for his reconstruction only the *Martyrium Prius* and *Alterum* and the Greek letter of the Achaian priest, neglecting completely the other important texts.

⁴² *Formen und Motive in der apokryphen Apostelgeschichte, Texte und Untersuchungen*, 59 (Leipzig, 1933), pp. 38-57.

⁴³ See James's review of Flamion's book in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, 13 (1912), pp. 435-437, and his work *The Apocryphal New Testament* (Oxford, 1924), pp. 337-357 (Acts of Andrew), 357-363 (The Martyrdom), 453-460 (Acts of Andrew and Matthew, Acts of Peter and Andrew).

LEGENDARY ELEMENTS

The publication of a recently discovered fragment of the original Acts, translated into Coptic from the Greek original^{43a} has, however, re-opened the controversy concerning the gnostic character of these Acts. The fragment describes an incident involving Andrew and the proconsul Varianus (Virinus in Gregory of Tours's "Miracles"), that happened in Thessalonica. Andrew is said to have addressed the soldiers, sent to arrest him, in the following words: "Are you ashamed to face me because you see your nature convicting and exposing you?" The discoverer of this fragment gives to these words a gnostic meaning, for he says that the author of the Acts knew of a basic distinction between psychic men whose nature predestined them to heavenly life and those who are of only a corporeal physical nature. This distinction was a characteristic trait of second-century gnosticism. The discoverer of the fragment sees, too, a similar allusion in the *Vaticanus Graecus* 808 and the *Laudatio* whose author, according to G. Quispel, also had access to the original Acts.^{43b}

This is an interesting observation which should be taken into consideration, but it would not, of itself, prove the gnostic origin of the Acts. Their author might have been influenced only by some gnostic notions or expressions currently popular among his contemporaries and regarded as harmless. The fragments of the original Acts contain really very few allusions which could justifiably be thought to suggest gnosticism.^{43c} Moreover, everything seems to indicate that the Acts were written in Achaëa in honor of a

^{43a} G. Quispel, "An Unknown Fragment of the Acts of Andrew (Pap. Copt. Utrecht N. 1)," *Vigiliae Christianae*, 10 (1956), pp. 129-148.

^{43b} R. A. Lipsius, M. Bonnet, *op. cit.*, 2, pt. 1, p. 44, line 14; M. Bonnet, "Acta Andreae Apostoli cum laudatione contexta," *Analecta Bollandiana*, 13 (1894), p. 348, lines 7-14; *idem*, *Supplementum codicis apocryphi*, 2 (Paris, 1895), p. 40. J. Flamion, however, seems to have shown (*op. cit.*, p. 205 seq.) that the author of the *Laudatio* did not use the original Acts. P. M. Peterson, in his pamphlet *Andrew, Brother of Simon Peter, his History and his Legends*, *Supplementum to Novum Testamentum*, 1 (Leiden, 1958), pp. 26 seq., follows Quispel's dating without adding any new evidence.

^{43c} R. Liechtenhan, in his study "Die pseudoepigraphische Literatur der Gnostiker," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft*, 3 (1902), pp. 295, 296, had reduced Lipsius' gnostic findings in Andrew's Acts to a minimum. Flamion was able, however, to show that even those findings that remained can be explained in the sense of neo-platonic teaching (J. Flamion, *op. cit.*, pp. 152, 155, 162).

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

martyr whose body was taken for that of the Apostle Andrew. Gnosticism, however, was not as popular in Greece, apparently, as in Asia Minor where it had originated.

The discoverer of the Coptic fragment sees also an interdependence between the Acts of Paul and the Acts of Andrew, but this does not mean that the author of the Pauline Acts used the Acts of Andrew, for if it could be proved that he had, it would mean that the Acts of Andrew had been composed before those of Paul—toward the end of the second century. Up to the present time, however, it seems safer to regard the Acts of Andrew as dependent upon the Acts of Paul.^{43d} All of this reveals how difficult it is to determine from the few fragments available for study the true character of the original Acts. Perhaps at some future date new discoveries will shed more light on this complicated problem, but, for our present purposes, we must be content to investigate further with evidence that thus far seems secure.

As already mentioned, the apocryphal Acts of John, Paul, Peter, Andrew, and Thomas were united in a special *corpus* of five books by the Manichaeans, who used them instead of the canonical Acts of the Apostles. This explains the repeated warnings of the Fathers against the reading of those Acts, some of which expressed ideas in vogue among the Manichaeans. The composition of all five Acts was often attributed, as by Photius, to one author—Leucius, who was supposed to have been St. John's disciple.⁴⁴ It is, however, agreed now that Leucius composed only the apocryphal Acts of St. John; the authors of the other Acts, including that of Andrew, remain anonymous.⁴⁵

Such are the results of our investigations. Regarding the Acts of Andrew, whether the original Acts were of gnostic origin, or

^{43d} The question of the inter-relationship of the apocryphal Acts of Paul, Thomas, and Andrew is still under discussion and cannot yet be regarded as near solution. For details see C. Schmidt, W. Schubert *Acta Pauli nach dem Papyrus der Hamburger Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek* (Hamburg-Glückstadt, 1936); E. Peterson, "Einige Bemerkungen zum Hamburger Papyrusfragment der Acta Pauli," *Vigiliae Christianae*, 3 (1949), pp. 142-162; P. Devos, "Actes de Thomas et actes de Paul," *AnBoll*, 69 (1951), pp. 119-130.

⁴⁴ Cf. Epiphanius, *Adversus Haereses*, chap. 51, 6, *PG*, 41, col. 896; *GCS*, 31, ed. Holl (1922), p. 255.

⁴⁵ I. E. Hennecke, *Neutest. Apokr.* (2nd ed.), p. 171, M. R. James, *op.cit.*, p. 228.

LEGENDARY ELEMENTS

whether they were written by an orthodox Greek rhetorician has not been seriously significant for our study. The principal point at issue was to determine at what period the report on Andrew's travels through Thrace and Byzantium to Achaea originated. In this respect it can be regarded as established that the account of Andrew's stay in Thrace was circulated in the East at a very early period; in any event, before the fourth century.

This is a very important conclusion. It remains now to determine to what extent this tradition of Andrew's stay in Byzantium can be regarded as trustworthy, how it originated, what legendary elements are hidden within it, and how it influenced the development of the Andrew tradition concerning Byzantium. Perhaps the examination of the reliability of this account will also help to determine its date and origin more accurately. In this respect the oldest reports of the activity of the apostles must first be examined in order to see if there is sufficient evidence for the assumption in the original Acts, and in their derivatives, that Andrew worked and died in Achaea.

It is well known that posterity is poorly informed as to the whereabouts of the apostles after they separated to convey their message throughout Palestine and the rest of the world.⁴⁶ With regard to Andrew's apostolic activity, the oldest and most reliable information must be attributed to Origen, whose knowledge has been transmitted to us by the first Church historian, Eusebius.⁴⁷ This old source

⁴⁶ Cf. the summary of known facts concerning this in I. E. Hennecke, *op. cit.*, pp. 117-125.

⁴⁷ *Hist. eccles.*, 3, 1; *GCS*, 2, pt. 1, ed. E. Schwartz, (1903), p. 188; *PG*, 20, col. 216. Eusebius quotes this information from the third book of Origen's commentary on Genesis. Even A. von Harnack (*Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* [Leipzig, 1924], p. 88), in spite of his—unjustified—hesitation to attribute this report to a pre-Origenist or Origenist tradition, agrees that "in the Paradosis on the three Apostles—Thomas, Andrew, John—we have the oldest account of the allocation of the lands of the earth to the Apostles." This is what Eusebius reports: τῶν δὲ ἱερῶν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἀποστόλων τε καὶ μαθητῶν ἐφ' ἅπασαν κατασπαρέντων τὴν οἰκουμένην, Θωμᾶς μὲν, ὡς ἡ παράδοσις περιέχει, τὴν Παρθίαν εἴληχεν, Ἀνδρέας δὲ τὴν Σκυθίαν, Ἰωάννης τὴν Ἀσίαν, πρὸς οὓς καὶ διατρίψας ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τελευτᾷ, Πέτρος δ' ἐν Πόντῳ καὶ Γαλατίᾳ καὶ Βιθυνίᾳ Καππαδοκίᾳ τε καὶ Ἀσίᾳ κεκηρυχέναι τοῖς [ἐκ] διασπορᾶς Ἰουδαίοις ἔοικεν· ὃς καὶ ἐπὶ τέλει ἐν Ῥώμῃ γενομένος, ἀνεσκολπίσθη κατὰ κεφαλῆς, οὕτως αὐτὸς ἀξιώσας παθεῖν. Τί δεῖ περὶ Παύλου λέγειν, ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ πεπληρωκότος τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ὕστερον ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπὶ Νέρωνος μεμαρτυρηκότος; ταῦτα Ὀριγένης κατὰ λέξιν ἐν τρίτῳ τόμῳ τῶν εἰς τὴν Γένεσιν ἐξηγητικῶν εἰρηται. Rufinus' translation of this passage (see *ibid.*, ed. Schwartz, p. 189) added to

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

states that Scythia was assigned to Andrew for his missionary activity, and such an assignment seems entirely credible.

The Scythians—an Indo-European people—established an important empire between 700 and 200 B.C. in what is now Southern Russia. They became well known to the Greeks, who had already heard of them through the intermediary of numerous Greek colonists on the northern shores of the Black Sea, and also to the nations of Asia Minor because the Scythians promoted commercial relations between the Russian interior and Asia on the one hand, and with the civilized Greek world on the other. When their empire collapsed about 179 B.C. under pressure from their racial brothers, the Sarmatians, the lands beyond the shores of the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov continued to be known in the Hellenistic world as Scythia. The Greek colonies on the coast were able to establish commercial relations with the new masters, and again became prosperous. Cherson and Panticapaeum, however, were incorporated into the Bosporan Kingdom, which was under Roman protection at the beginning of the Christian era.

It is known, too, that from the last century B.C. onward numerous Jewish settlements existed among the Greek colonies on the Crimean coast and the coast of the Sea of Azov. The Jews of this Diaspora, moreover, manifested an unusual religious zeal. Around their synagogues were grouped many proselytes called, in the inscriptions dating from the first centuries of the Christian era, worshippers of the Highest God.⁴⁸ Thus it seems quite natural that this region

Eusebius' report of what he had learned about Matthew and Bartholomew: *Thomas, sicut nobis traditum est, sortitus est Parthos, Matthaeus Aethiopiam, Bartholomaeus Indiam citeriorem, Andreas Scythiam, Iohannes Asiam, unde apud Ephesum et commoratus est et defunctus. Petrus Pontum, Galatiam, Bithyniam, Cappadociam ceterasque confines provincias Iudaeis dumtaxat praedicans circumnisse deprehenditur* . . . A. A. T. Ehrhardt (*The Apostolic Succession* [London, 1953], p. 68) refutes von Harnack's misgivings. However, Origen does not mention Achaëa as a missionary field of Andrew, and this contradicts Ehrhardt's contention that, because Andrew is mentioned along with four other apostles whose Acts were then known, Andrew's Acts must also have existed in Origen's time.

⁴⁸ See E. Schürer, "Die Juden im bosporanischen Reiche und die Genossenschaften der σεβόμενοι θεὸν ὑψίστου," *Sitzungsberichte der königlichen preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse* (Berlin, 1897), pp. 200–225. See also his additional notes in *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 22 (1897), cols. 236–238, 505–507. F. Cumont in his short study "Hypsistos" in *Supplément à la Revue de l'instruction publique en Belgique* (Brussels, 1897),

LEGENDARY ELEMENTS

should have been one of the first targets of Christian propaganda in apostolic times. This Diaspora opened an easy route of access into the "hinterland" still called "Scythia."

There are some extant indications that missionary activity in Scythia must have started early, and that it had some success. Arnobius, Origen, and Tertullian speak of Christianity among the the Scythians and Parthians,⁴⁹ which shows that during the second century there already existed among the Scythians some Christian communities that, to judge from Eusebius' words,⁵⁰ were, by his time, well organized.

Thus Origen's statement that Andrew preached in Scythia seems to be well founded. In the same passage he further testifies that Peter preached to the Jewish Diaspora in Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, Cappadocia, and Asia, and from there went to Rome where he was crucified. It has been seen that some legendary accounts—namely the *Acta Petri et Andreae*—present the two brothers, Peter and Andrew, as preaching the Gospel together in the lands of the barbarians. In Gregory's *Miracles*, Andrew is said to have preached in

completed Schürer's findings showing that a similar influence of the Jewish Diaspora on paganism existed in Asia Minor also. He discovered intimate links between the cult of Sabazius, especially widespread in Phrygia, and Judaism (Sabaoth or Sabbath?), concluding that in that region "les collègues d'adorateurs du Très-Haut sont nés des anciens thiasés de Sebazios" (p. 6). All this prepared the ground for Christianity. "L'on s'explique mieux," Cumont continues, "en tenant compte de cette situation, que la foi nouvelle ait opéré plus de conversions en Asie Mineure, que dans toute autre région" (p. 8). This provides an explanation for the apostles' concentrating their activity on this region, and strengthens the probability of Andrew's preaching in the Crimea and Scythia. The Jewish Diaspora of these lands was in intimate contact with the Jewish communities in Asia Minor. Cf. also E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, 3 (4th ed., Leipzig, 1909), p. 174, and F. Dvornik, *Les légendes de Constantin et de Méthode vues de Byzance*, p. 171, footnote 2. The Ethiopian text, "Martyrdom of St. Andrew in Scythia" (*The Contendings of the Apostles*, 2, transl. and ed. by E. A. Wallis Budge [London, 1901], pp. 215 seq.), seems also to reflect strongly the early tradition of Andrew's missionary activity.

⁴⁹ Arnobius, *Adversus nationes*, 1, chap. 16, *CSEL*, 4, ed. A. Reifferscheid (1875), p. 12; Origen, *Commentarii in Matthaeum* (Matt. 24:9), *GCS*, 38, ed. E. Klostermann (1933), p. 76; Tertullian *Adversus Iudaeos*, *CSEL*, 70, ed. E. Kroymann (1942), p. 273. See more complete references in A. von Harnack, *op. cit.*, pp. 533 seq., 537, 539 seq., 542, 546.

⁵⁰ *Demonstratio evangelica*, 3, chap. 4, *GCS* 23, ed. I. A. Heikel, p. 119. Cf. also *ibid.*, 1, chap. 2, p. 9, *PG* 22, col. 204B; cf. col. 25D. Cf. also Justin's *Dialogus cum Tryphone Iudaeo*, chap. 117, *PG*, 6, col. 748, and von Harnack's comment on it in *Die Ausbreitung*, p. 546.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

Pontus (Amaseia), in Paphlagonia (Sinope), in Bithynia (Nicomedia), and in Asia (Nicaea). A part of this tradition could be based on fact.^{50a} If other, more secure, confirmation is not available on Peters' and Andrew's joint activities in Asia Minor, it is at least reasonable to see in the report an indication that Andrew reached Scythia through Asia Minor, and that the goal of his travels in Asia Minor was the northern coast of Pontus or of Paphlagonia, whence he wished to embark for Scythia.

In reality, Sinope in Paphlagonia, which is mentioned in Andrew's apocrypha, was, at the beginning of the Christian era, the most important trading center on the coast of the Black Sea, and a port that virtually monopolized the trade between the interior of Asia Minor and Parthia and the northern coast of the Black Sea. Under the reign of Mithridates (113-62 B.C.), King of Pontus, who had extended his domination over the Bosphorus, Sinope was also a first-class military base, and the city retained its important position even after the decline of Pontus and the Bosporan Kingdom. Its importance was eclipsed only in the fourth century when Constantinople was founded and began to attract all commercial traffic to its port. The belief, popular at the time of its eminence, that Sinope boasted an ambo from which Andrew preached⁵¹ may be older than the original Acts, and thus could be founded on fact. In this tradition the apocryphal writers found a historical basis for some of their stories.

Even the stories about the city of the anthropophagites, may reflect an indirect echo of Andrew's missionary activity in Scythia.

^{50a} Cf. what Th. Zahn says in his *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, 6 (Leipzig, 1900), pp. 220 seq. In Muratori's Fragment John is said to have started his Gospel after having been urged by Andrew to write it. See what A. A. T. Ehrhardt says (in his study, "The Gospels in the Muratorian Fragment," *Ostkirchliche Studien*, 2 [1953], pp. 126 seq.) on Andrew's relation to the "Johannine circle," and on the frequency with which Andrew appears in the old tradition of Asia Minor. Some local traditions also seem to point to Andrew's stay in Asia. Theophanes Continuatus (ed. Bonn, p. 21) reports, for example, that when the Emperor Nicephorus I (802-811) was hunting on the Asiatic coast near the ruins of a Satyrus temple he found there an altar with the inscription: "This is an altar of St. Michael, prince of the celestial army, which was erected by the Apostle Andrew." Cf. R. Janin, *Constantinople byzantine* (Paris, 1950), pp. 460 seq.

⁵¹ R. A. Lipsius, *op. cit.*, 1, p. 604.

LEGENDARY ELEMENTS

Some of the tribes of the Northeastern coast of the *Pontus Euxeinus* had had, since classical times, a very bad reputation as particularly dangerous pirates. Strabo,⁵² who wrote his *Geography* in the last decade before Christ, mentions especially the Achaei, the Zygi, and the Heniochi, and describes the daring raids of their fleets of "camarae"—covered boats—against merchant vessels, cities, and even whole countries. He says also that the peoples of the Bosphorus were often in collusion with them.

Here, then, we find the source of the extravagant charges of cannibalism levelled against these tribes by Aristotle.⁵³ Such stories also circulated among Christians, and Tertullian⁵⁴ preserved a vivid reminder of them in his writing against Marcion. This was a topic which appealed particularly to the writers of romances, and it provides a logical explanation of the origin of the strange experiences attributed to the Apostles in the fabulous city of the anthropophagites.

The city's name also should be connected with the early tradition of Andrew's preaching in Scythia. The Greek Acts of Andrew and Matthias do not disclose its name, but in Gregory's extract from these Acts the city to which Andrew was sent by the Lord to free Matthias is called Myrmidona.⁵⁵ This could be identified with the

⁵² Strabo, *Rerum geographicarum*, 11, chap. 2, 12, ed. H. L. Jones, 5 (Loeb Classical Library, 1924), pp. 202 seq. Strabo distinguishes Scythia proper from Little Scythia, modern Dobrudža, which was a part of Thracia, but which was established by Diocletian as the separate province of Scythia (*ibid.*, 7, chap. 4, 5, chap. 5, 12, ed. H. L. Jones, 3, pp. 241, 273). With reference to Andrew only Scythia proper can be meant.

⁵³ Aristotle, *Politics*, 1338b, 22, ed. H. Rackham (Loeb Classical Library, 1932), p. 646: πολλὰ δ' ἐστὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἃ πρὸς τὸ κτείνειν καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἀνθρωποφαγίαν εὐχερῶς ἔχει, καθάπερ τῶν περὶ τὸν Πόντον Ἀχαιοὶ τε καὶ Ἡνίχιοι, καὶ τῶν ἡπειρωτικῶν ἐθνῶν ἕτερα. . . . Herodotus (*Historiae* 4, pp. 18, 106, ed. A. D. Godley, 2 [Loeb Classical Library, 1938], pp. 218, 306) mentioned maneaters, a tribe dwelling north of the farming Scythians. He probably meant a Finnish tribe, ancestors of the Mordwa.

⁵⁴ *Adversus Marcionem*, 1, chap. 1, *PL*, 2, col. 271; *CSEL*, 47, ed. E. Kroy-mann (1906), p. 291. Curiously enough the pagan philosopher who attacked the Christian teaching on the Eucharist, and whose objections are refuted by Macarius Magnes, seems to know nothing of Scythian cannibalism. Cf. A. von Harnack, *Kritik des Neuen Testaments von einem griechischen Philosophen des 3. Jahrhunderts*, in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, 37, pt. 4 (Leipzig, 1911), chap. 3, pp. 15, 46.

⁵⁵ Cf. A. von Gutschmid, "Die Königsnamen in den apokryphen Apostelgeschichten" in *Kleine Schriften*, ed. F. Rühl, 2 (Leipzig, 1890), pp. 380 seq., first published in *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, Neue Folge*, 19 (1864), pp. 391 seq.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

city of Myrmekion on the Chersonnesus of Taurus. It lay on the shore of "the Cimmerian Bosphorus, at a distance of twenty *stadia* from Panticapaeum," which is called by Strabo⁵⁶ "the greatest trading center of the barbarians."

Although the Greek Acts of Andrew and Matthias, in the version extant today, do not name the city of the anthropophagites, Gregory must have used a Latin translation of these Acts in which it was named. Actually both versions of the recently discovered Latin translation call the city in which Matthias was kept prisoner, Mermedonia or Mirmidonia.⁵⁷

However, the reticence of the author of the Greek Acts of Andrew and Matthias concerning the name poses a problem. Flamion advanced the theory that these Acts were written in Egypt, and that the man eaters to whom Matthias was sent to preach were Ethiopian tribes invading Upper Egypt at the time the Acts were composed.⁵⁸ This theory has its weaknesses. First, Flamion's main argument for the Egyptian origin of the Acts—the reference to speaking sphinxes—cannot be regarded as definitive, for Egypt was not the only country where such a story could have originated. All cultivated Greeks must have known about the existence of the sphinxes, and were certainly as much impressed by the imposing monuments of Egyptian architecture as are most people today. Moreover, Herodotus had already spoken of the sphinxes, and had placed such monuments in Scythia as well as in Egypt. According to him, the palace of the Scythian King Skytes was surrounded by sphinxes and griffons.⁵⁹ This, of course, does not mean that Flamion's deductions are not correct. On one point—the most important one—his findings concerning this literary document are without doubt correct; namely, that the Acts of Andrew and Matthias have never formed part of the original Acts of Andrew.⁶⁰ They are an independent work with no doctrinal purpose; simply an account of the miracles

⁵⁶ *Op. cit.*, 7, chaps. 4, 5, ed. H. L. Jones, 3, *ibid.*, p. 240.

⁵⁷ F. Blatt, *op. cit.*, pp. 33, 35, 39, 41 (*recensio Casanatensis*), 96–98, 101, 103, 138, 140, 146, 148 (*recensio Vaticana*). His commentary on Myrmidonia, pp. 6 seq.

⁵⁸ J. Flamion, *op. cit.*, pp. 310 seq.

⁵⁹ Herodotus, *op. cit.*, 4, chap. 79, ed. A. D. Godley, *ibid.*, 2, p. 278.

⁶⁰ J. Flamion, *op. cit.*, pp. 301 seq.

LEGENDARY ELEMENTS

attributed to the Apostles. Flamion's comparison⁶¹ of these Acts with the Acts of Peter and Andrew, the *Martyrium Matthaei*, and the latest recensions of the Acts of Thomas and the Acts of Peter, the latter of which are preserved only in a Slavonic translation,⁶² clearly shows that all of these writings represent a new kind of apostolic romance, free of the doctrinal tendencies traceable in the original Acts of Peter, Paul, John, and Andrew, and that they manifest a different spirit, more imbued with orthodox Christian thinking, than do the original Acts.

Nor should the possibility of Egyptian origin for these Acts be dismissed. There are in all of them many instances which strongly suggest that their authors were entirely familiar with monastic life as it existed in Egypt in the fourth and fifth centuries, and this seems a stronger link to Egyptian origin than any mention of sphinxes. Flamion's⁶³ suggestion that they were written in Egypt before the year 400 can, therefore, be accepted.

⁶¹ *Idem.*, pp. 269-300.

⁶² Published by I. Franko, "Beiträge aus dem Kirchenslavischen zu den Apokryphen des N. T.: Zu den gnostischen Περὶ τοῦ Πέτρου," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 3 (1902), pp. 315 seq.

⁶³ J. Flamion, *op. cit.*, p. 318. S. Reinach ("Les apôtres chez les anthropophages," *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuse*, 9 [1904], pp. 305-320) had already tried to show the Egyptian origin of this romance. The newly discovered fourth-century Coptic fragment of the original Acts of Andrew, which is followed by a "typical monk-story" from an account of the Patriarch Joseph, testifies to the popularity which Andrew's Acts had enjoyed in Egyptian monastic circles. This strengthens Flamion's thesis concerning the Egyptian origin of the Acts of Andrew and Matthias and the Acts of Peter and Andrew and of their fourth-century date when monachism flourished in Egypt. P. M. Peterson's opinion (in his pamphlet, *Andrew, Brother of Simon Peter*, pp. 7, 32) that the Acts of Andrew and Matthias were written before 254 and that Origen's report of Andrew's preaching in Scythia was taken from these Acts is altogether unsubstantiated. The Acts do not mention Scythia; it was Matthias, not Andrew, who was sent to the land of the man-eaters. The land where Andrew preached before he was ordered by the Lord to liberate Matthias was apparently far from the city of the cannibals, as was the land of the barbarians to which Andrew proceeded after liberating Matthias, but there is no evidence to suggest that the two lands were identical. It can be assumed that the anonymous author of the Acts imagined Andrew preaching in Achaëa, whence he was sent to the city of the man-eaters. Only there did he begin to preach to the "barbarians."

There are several serious errors in Peterson's short compilation, for example: He puts both the twelfth-century homilist Theophanes "Cerameus" and the fourteenth-century Church historian Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos in the ninth century (pp. 17, 18), and quotes them in connection with his dating of Pseudo-Epiphanius. He calls Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus (Kyrros) in Syria, Theodoret of Cyprus (p. 12). On page 11 he says that

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

The alternative suggestion—that the maneaters to whom Matthias was sent to preach should be identified with Ethiopian tribes which were invading Upper Egypt in the fourth century—is the weakest of all the arguments, and is inadequately supported, although it should be admitted that ancient authors located anthropophagites in Africa also; a point missed by Flamion. Ptolemy⁶⁴ located them on Africa's east coast, somewhere between Zanzibar and Sofala. These tribes were far removed from Upper Egypt. Pliny,⁶⁵ however, speaks vaguely of maneaters in the upper reaches of the Nile, which strengthens Flamion's theory. Unfortunately, there is nothing in the Acts to justify our thinking that its author had the Ethiopians in mind. He located the maneaters⁶⁶ in a city near the sea because they were said to hunt their prey in boats, and it could hardly be claimed that such a city existed among the tribes that Pliny had in mind. The author's very apparent vagueness in his geographical references suggests that he located the city of the maneaters not near Egypt, but in a far distant land. One would expect that if he had had the Ethiopian tribes in mind, he would have been more specific, for their invasions must have filled the minds of the native population with horror and hatred.

On the other hand, tales of the existence of cannibals along the northeastern coast of the Black Sea were widely circulated and were known not only in Greece, but also in Africa, as is attested by Tertullian; so it seems logical to think that they were known in Egypt as well. Thus we can conclude, with some justification, that the

the Church historian Socrates "makes the first mention of Argyropolis possessing a bishop." This is a misinterpretation of a passage (*Hist. Eccles.*, 7, 25; PG, 67, col. 796) explaining that, because of its beautiful location, the Patriarch Atticus named the suburb of Constantinople that was opposite Chrysopolis, Argyropolis. Hesychius of Jerusalem died not in 440, as Peterson says (p. 11), but probably after 450; and Petrus Chrysologus died not in 450 (p. 12), but about 433. In all of this the author betrays an unfortunate misunderstanding or inaccurate evaluation of elementary matters, and, further, he occasionally quotes primary sources from secondary authorities.

⁶⁴ *Geographia* 4, chap. 8, 3: Αἰθιοπες ἀνθρωποφάγοι. I used the photo-reproduction of *Codex Urbinatus Graecus* 82 (Claudius Ptolemaeus, *Geographiae Codex Urbinatus Graecus* 82, ed. P. Franchi de' Cavalieri (Leipzig, 1932), fol. 36v.

⁶⁵ C. Plinius Secundus, *Historia Naturalis*, 6, 195, ed. H. Rackham, 2 (Loeb Classical Library, 1942), p. 482. Pliny himself calls the region in which he places his *Anthropophagi* purely imaginary.

⁶⁶ Ed. R. A. Lipsius, M. Bonnet in *Acta Apost. apocr.*, 2, pt. 1, chap. 22, p. 96.

LEGENDARY ELEMENTS

author of the Acts of Andrew and Matthias, who may have lived in Egypt or in some other country where Greek was a common language, had in mind Andrew's original missionary territory, Scythia, when speaking of the anthropophagites, and located the cannibals in that neighborhood.

This conclusion seems supported by the fact that in the Acts of Peter and Andrew, which are the continuation of the Acts of Andrew and Matthias, or at least assume their existence, Andrew, after his return from the city of the man-eaters to the mountain where Peter, Matthias, Alexander, and Rufus were gathered, is sent with Peter and these disciples, by Christ, to the city of the barbarians.⁶⁷ This lends further support to the tradition that Andrew was Apostle to the barbarian Scythians. The Greeks of Achaëa could hardly have been called barbarians by a Greek writer of the fourth or fifth century.

Moreover, another of these apocryphal writings, the *Martyrium Matthaei*, calls the city of the man-eaters to which Matthew—not Matthias here—is sent by Christ, the city of Myrna (Myrne).⁶⁸ This name recalls the city of Myrmidona in Gregory of Tours's works, and of Mirmidonia about which we read in both versions of the Latin translation of the Acts of Andrew and Matthias. This strongly suggests that Myrna, or a similar name, might also have been given to this city in some Greek versions of the Acts of Andrew and Matthias. If such was the case, it would be clear that the author of these Acts had in mind Myrmekion, near Andrew's original missionary land.⁶⁹

⁶⁷ *Idem*, p. chap. 1, pp. 117, 118.

⁶⁸ *Idem*, chap. 4, p. 220.

⁶⁹ Even the fourteenth-century Church historian, Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos (*Historia Ecclesiastica*, 2, chap. 41, PG, 145, col. 865) preserved the memory of the story, and in describing Matthias' death, called the city in which he died Myrmene, basing his account on the apocryphal *Martyrium Matthaei*. The legend of the man-eaters attracted the attention of V. G. Vasil'evskij, who devoted a short monograph to it: "Choždenie apostola Andreja v strane Mirmidonjan," *Žurnal ministerstva narodnago prosvěščenija*, 189, pt. 2 (1877), pp. 41–82, 157–185. Cf. also the account of Andrew's legend given by S. V. Petrovskij, "Apokrifičeskija skazanija ob apostol'skoj propovedi po černomorskemu poberežiju," *Žapiski imp. Odesskago obščestva istorii i drevnosti*, 21 (1898), pp. 1–84. The author rightly pointed out that all of these accounts assumed Andrew's activity to have been along the north coast of the *Pontus Euxinus*.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

As has been shown, the Greek version of the Acts of Andrew and Matthias does not specify the country in which Andrew was preaching when he received the Lord's command to go to the city of the maneaters. The Acts of Peter and Andrew speak only of the lands of the barbarians where the two Apostles were sent to preach. The Latin translation of the Acts of Andrew and Matthias, also used by Gregory of Tours, identifies the country, however, as Achaea. This is reminiscent of two traditions—the earlier attributing Scythia to Andrew as his missionary field, and the later placing his activity in Achaea. The authors of the two Greek Acts seem still to have been impressed by the earlier tradition, and although they probably knew the later one, they did not dare to follow it explicitly and preferred to be vague about Andrew's missionary field. The Latin translator, on the other hand, followed the new tradition.

Nevertheless, even Gregory's description provides a faint suggestion of the old tradition. He has Andrew come from the city of the maneaters to Amaseia and Sinope in Pontus and Paphlagonia, which indicates that the site of Myrmidona was usually located in the older apocrypha on the coast opposite Pontus—in the Crimea or Scythia.

The city of maneaters is identified with Sinope only as a later tradition which we come upon in the last phases of the development of the Andrew Legend when popular imagination concentrated on describing the Apostle's activity in better known lands, such as Asia Minor, Greece, and Achaea, and his activity in Scythia was forgotten.

This identification of Myrmidona with Sinope can be found for the first time in Theodosius' description of his pilgrimage to Jerusalem, written about 550.⁷⁰ The author of the *Narratio*⁷¹ was also acquainted with this new tradition, but he was still to some

⁷⁰ Theodosius, *De situ Terrae Sanctae in Itinera Hierosolymitana*, CSEL, 39, ed. P. Geyer (1898), pp. 144: *De Cersona usque in Sinope, ubi dominus Andreas liberavit domnum Matheum evangelistam de carcere. . . . Quae Sinopi illo tempore Myrmidona dicebatur, et omnes, qui ibi manebant, homines pares suos comedebant.*

⁷¹ M. Bonnet, *Supplementum cod. apocr.*, 2, p. 48 (*AnBoll.*, 13, p. 356).

LEGENDARY ELEMENTS

degree impressed by the old one, and toned down the whole story. He has Andrew preach first in Bithynia, and then mentions a miracle performed by the Apostle in Nicaea. After that he transports his hero to Thrace whence he is allowed to reach Scythia. From Scythia, Andrew is said first to have visited the shores of Colchis, and afterward to have reached Sinope.

The people of Sinope are depicted in the *Narratio* as "blood-eaters"; cruel to their neighbors and to all visitors. They imprisoned Matthias, along with others, but no allusion is made to their cannibalism, which shows how the original tradition, placing the anthropophagites in or near Scythia, was even then being slowly pushed into the background, while the new tradition identifying the city of the cannibals with Sinope was gaining ground.

This explains why the copyists of the *Acta Andreae et Matthiae*—one in the tenth and the other in the sixteenth century—influenced by the new tradition, identified Sinope with the city of the man-eaters,⁷² although the older manuscripts of these Acts, as noted above, do not mention the city of the cannibals by name.

The monk Epiphanius accepted the new identification in his *Vita Andreae*,⁷³ written in the ninth century. He not only placed the anthropophagites at Sinope, but, in addition, blamed the Jews of that city for furthering this practice, and in this respect he was followed by the *Laudatio*,⁷⁴ a homily of St. Andrew of the same period. It is interesting to see how the tradition grew, and how one legend was replaced by another.⁷⁵

⁷² *Parisinus Graecus*, 881 (tenth century), *Escorial Y II*, 4 (sixteenth century). Moreover in the *Parisinus Graecus*, 1313 (fifteenth century) Andrew starts from Amasia to go to the city of the anthropophagites (fol. 110) in order to liberate Matthias. On fols. 159^r, 159^v the city of Myrmyne is mentioned. The present writer has been able to verify the readings in only the Parisian manuscripts. Cf. R. A. Lipsius, M. Bonnet, *ibid.*, pp. xxiii, 65. The principal manuscript used by M. Bonnet for his edition of the Acts of Andrew and Matthias (*Parisinus Supplementum Graecum*, 824 [ninth century]) is not listed in Omont's catalogue. We find in the catalogue, under this number, only *Passio S. Barbarae*. The *Acta Andreae et Matthiae* are scattered throughout the manuscript on the following folios, and in the following order: 10^v, 9, 8, 7, 2, 5, 4, 3, 1^v.

⁷³ *PG*, 120, col. 220. On Epiphanius see *infra* p. 225.

⁷⁴ M. Bonnet, *op. cit.*, p. 9 (*AnBoll*, 13, p. 317). Cf. *infra* p. 227.

⁷⁵ See also S. V. Petrovskij, *op. cit.*, pp. 155 seq.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

It is most probable—as mentioned before⁷⁶—that the original Acts depicted Andrew's activity in only Asia Minor, Thrace, and Achaea. This is clearly indicated by Philastrius of Brescia, who says that the Acts described Andrew's activity on his way from Pontus to Greece. Gregory of Tours, as already noted, also starts his narrative of Andrew's miracles with the Apostle's stay in Pontus.

This, however, does not mean that the anonymous author of the original Acts did not know about Andrew's activity in Scythia, although very likely he did not even mention that country in his narrative.⁷⁷ At the end of the third century, when he composed his work, the tradition of Andrew's apostolic activity in Scythia was still too well known to be ignored. He simply supposed that Andrew, after finishing his preaching in Scythia, returned to the northern coast of Asia Minor; so he limited himself to describing Andrew's journey from Pontus to Greece, and evidently wrote Andrew's Acts only in order to connect the Apostle with Greece, Achaea, and Patras where, in his belief, Andrew had died a martyr's death. The lack of reference to Scythia in the original Acts cannot, therefore, be used as an argument against Andrew's activity in that country.

There is yet another tradition which, although it also developed later, can be explained in the light of the oldest report on Andrew's missionary activity in Scythia. This is the belief that Andrew preached in Sebastopolis, on the northeastern coast of the Black Sea, and at the mouths of the Apsarus and Phasis Rivers. This tradition is reflected in Pseudo-Epiphanius' List of Apostles and Disciples, which, as has been shown, could have been composed only at the end of the seventh or, rather, at the beginning of the eighth centuries. When the tradition of Andrew's preaching in Greece and Achaea was created and connected with his activity in Byzantium, it was necessary to have him return from Scythia to the shores of the *Pontus Euxeinus* whence he could have reached Thrace. If the Sogdianoï mentioned by the author of Pseudo-Epiphanius' list could be identified with an Alanic tribe living between Phoullae and Sugdaea in the Crimea, it would be quite

⁷⁶ See *supra* pp. 188, 194.

⁷⁷ J. Flamion, *op. cit.*, pp. 244 seq., saw very clearly the importance of this statement.

LEGENDARY ELEMENTS

natural that the author should first have Andrew come back from the interior of Scythia to the coast of the Crimea. The Sugdaeans may have been known to him. They were Christians in his time, although in the ninth century the Slavic missionary Constantine-Cyril on his way to the Khazars, found that they still practiced some pagan rites. His biographer quotes the Sugdaeans among peoples using their own language in the liturgy,⁷⁸

This identification, although extremely hypothetical is possible because Pseudo-Epiphanius places the Sogdianoï immediately after the Scythians, and because some manuscripts also use the form Sogdianoï. In any case, writers dependent on Pseudo-Epiphanius—if not he, himself—identified the Sogdianoï with the inhabitants of Sogdiana between the Rivers Oxus and Iaxartes.

The Gorsinians cannot be identified with certainty. The most logical suggestion appears to be that their name is a deformation of Georgia, as the country of Iberia is now called,⁷⁹ and this implies that Pseudo-Epiphanius regarded Andrew as a missionary to the Georgians also.

To these peoples are added, in some texts, the Sakai,⁸⁰ listed after the Sogdianoï. The Sakai were a mysterious people, located by the old geographers in the neighborhood of the Indians, Baktroi and Sogdians, either east of the Caspian Sea or beyond the River Iaxartes. This must have sounded fantastic, for other copyists preferred to call it, instead of Sakai, Thrakai,⁸¹ thus bringing Andrew nearer his goal. This confusion of names among nations occupying such widely distant regions, sometimes summarized merely as "exterior Ethiopians," is poor testimony to the reliability of such a tradition.

The city of Sebastopolis, which arose in Augustus' time near the

⁷⁸ See F. Dvornik, *Légendes*, pp. 205, 208, 370, 375.

⁷⁹ This interpretation was proposed to R. A. Lipsius (*op. cit.*, 2, pt. 2, p. 430) by A. von Gutschmid, in a letter, and was also approved by Nöldeke.

⁸⁰ See the different readings of the names of peoples to whom Andrew was supposed to have preached, in R. A. Lipsius, *op. cit.*, 1, pp. 567 seq.; especially in Th. Schermann, *Propheten und Apostellegenden nebst Jünger katalogen des Dorotheus und verwandter Texte*, pp. 247 seq.

⁸¹ See the comparison of the different readings in the manuscripts of the texts in R. A. Lipsius, *ibid.*, pp. 568 seq. Cf. also Th. Schermann, *ibid.* pp. 134 seq.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

ruins of the former Greek colony of Dioscurias⁸² on the coast of Colchis, was a logical stopping place on the way from the Crimea to Sinope. According to local tradition, St. Andrew preached there, together with Simon the Cananean. It is difficult to ascertain when this tradition began, but it became fully developed only in the ninth century, when it was reported by the monk Epiphanius.⁸³ However, some traces of the tradition, as it concerned Simon, are found in Moses of Chorene's Armenian history (fifth century).⁸⁴

It is possible that the legend of the preaching of Simon the Cananean in Sebastopolis and on the coast of Colchis penetrated from Syria to this region at an early date, but it would be bold to venture a similar supposition concerning Andrew. In any case it is an established fact that the Georgians themselves knew nothing before the very end of the ninth century about the preaching of the Apostle Andrew in their country.⁸⁵ It is mentioned for the first time in the Life of St. Peter the Iberian, an enlarged edition of which was composed by the archpriest Paul.⁸⁶ The author of the Life got his information from Nicetas the Philosopher, who can only be the Byzantine author (d. 890) of a panegyric on Andrew actually reporting Andrew as having preached in Iberia.⁸⁷ Thus it is evident that this idea was imported into Iberia from abroad.

⁸² Cf. M. Orbeli, "Gorod Bliznecov Διοσκουρίας i plemja Voznic 'Hvloxoi,'" *Žurnal ministerstva narodnago prosveščeniya*, N.S. 3 (St. Petersburg, 1911), pp. 195-215.

⁸³ *Vita S. Andreae*, PG, 120, col. 244. On Epiphanius see *infra* p. 225.

⁸⁴ See V. Langlois, *Collection des historiens anciens et modernes de l'Arménie*, 2 (Paris, 1867), bk. II, chap. 34, p. 98. Cf. R. A. Lipsius, *op. cit.*, 1, p. 580; 2, pt., 2, pp. 142-146, who took some of his information from A. von Gutschmid's very useful study "Die Königsnamen in den apokr. Apostelgesch.," *op. cit.*, pp. 369 seq. (*Rhein. Mus.*, 19, pp. 361 seq.).

⁸⁵ This was demonstrated very clearly by I. Džavakov in his study "Propovedničeskaja dčjatel'nost' ap. Andreja i sv. Niny. II. Apostol Andrej v Gruzii," *Žurnal ministerstva narodnago prosveščeniya*, 333 (St. Petersburg, 1901), pp. 101-113. On the origins of Christianity on the coast of Colchis and among the Georgians see K. Kekelidze, *Die Bekehrung Georgiens zum Christentum* (Leipzig, 1928). For more complete indications see P. Peeters, "Les débuts du christianisme en Géorgie d'après les sources hagiographiques," *AnBoll*, 50 (1932), pp. 1-58. The legendary tradition on Andrew's activity in Iberia was invoked by the Georgians in the eleventh century when they claimed the independence of their Church from the patriarchate of Antioch. See the "Life of St. George the Hagiorite" in P. Peeters' study "Histoires monastiques géorgiennes," *ibid.* 36-37 (1917-1918), pp. 116 seq., 132 seq.

⁸⁶ Published by N. Marr in *Palestinskij Sbornik*, 47 (1896), pp. xv, 82.

⁸⁷ PG, 105, col. 64.

LEGENDARY ELEMENTS

This conclusion is of some importance for the purposes of our investigation. If the Gorsinians mentioned in Pseudo-Epiphanius' catalogue can be identified with the Georgians, Pseudo-Epiphanius should be regarded as the inventor of this legend. He was followed by other Byzantine writers, and from Byzantium the Legend at last penetrated to the country where, logically, it should have originated, but which, until the end of the ninth century, had been content to have as its principal missionary St. Nina.⁸⁸ It is a fact that the oldest tradition had Andrew preach in Scythia, whither he came by sea from Sinope in Paphlagonia, and it was this that induced Pseudo-Epiphanius to indicate that Andrew had preached on the Caucasian coast on his return from Scythia.

On the whole it is, therefore, reasonable to say that the oldest report on Andrew's activity, attributed to Origen, seems to be as reliably confirmed and clear as can be expected in view of the few sources of information extant today; but what of the other tradition of Andrew's voyage through the Black Sea to Byzantium and thence through Thrace and Macedonia to Achaea where, in Patras, he is said to have suffered a death similar to that of his brother Peter in Rome?

First of all, it is, strange that Origen, or the transmitter of this old tradition to Eusebius, who knew about Andrew's missionary activity in Scythia, knew nothing of his work in Achaea, or of his death in Patras. Origen—or Eusebius' witness to the old tradition—reports on the activity of five Apostles: Thomas in India, Andrew in Scythia, John in Asia, Peter in the provinces of Asia Minor and in Rome, and Paul from Jerusalem to as far afield as Illyricum. But in only three cases does he indicate where they died: Peter and Paul in Rome under Nero, and John in Ephesus. No such information is given about Thomas and Andrew, and one gets the impression that, in the opinion of Origen or whoever transmitted the oldest tradition, these two Apostles died where they had preached: Thomas in India and Andrew in Scythia.

⁸⁸ See S. V. Petrovskij's analysis of the Georgian Legend and its comparison with Epiphanius and the *Laudatio*, *op. cit.*, pp. 132-150. The author dated the composition of the Georgian Legend after that of Epiphanius and the *Laudatio*, perhaps also after that of Symeon Metaphrastes.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

Origen's silence in this respect—his name is at least quoted by Eusebius—carries the more weight in that he had been in rather close contact with Achaëa. He visited that country twice; first about 230 and then about 240.⁸⁹ He must thus have been well acquainted with the religious traditions of this province, and if he had heard of Andrew's activity in Achaëa and of his death in Patras, he would undoubtedly have mentioned it in his report on the Apostle's activities. The fact that he did not indicates that, in his time, this tradition did not exist.

Moreover, there seem to be some details in the description of Andrew's martyrdom in Patras which do not agree with historical facts. The names of the proconsuls of Achaëa—Lesbius and Egeates—found in the Acts cannot be verified. This, and the fact that their names are Greek rather than Latin, arouses the strongest doubts. Even if it be admitted that, between 44 and 67, and again after a few years' interruption, Achaëa had been governed under the mandate of the Senate by former praetors with the title of proconsul, it can hardly be conceded that they resided in Patras. Corinth was much more suitable as the residence of a Roman governor; it was the first Roman colony in Achaëa, and the most important trading center of the country.

The report on Andrew's preaching in Achaëa conflicts with other more reliable reports on the penetration of Christianity into the province. St. Paul was its principal Apostle. He founded the Christian community in Corinth and was especially solicitous of the first Christians; tasks in which he was aided by his disciples, particularly by St. Luke the Evangelist. Admittedly there is no reason to reject the possibility that Achaëa could have been the missionary field of more than one apostle, but it seems at least strange that the oldest tradition, represented by Luke's Acts of the Apostles and by Origen, did not even mention Andrew's preaching in that country.

Moreover, according to another very old tradition, St. Luke is said to have written his Gospel in Achaëa. This is attested by the

⁸⁹ Eusebius, *Hist. eccles.* 6, 23, 32; *PG*, 20, cols. 576, 592; ed. E. Schwartz, pp. 570, 586. Cf. E. de Faye, *Origène, sa vie, son oeuvre, sa pensée*, 1 (2nd ed., Paris, 1923-1928), pp. 31, 43. See what J. Flamion (*op. cit.*, pp. 245 seq.) says on Origen's relations with Achaëa.

LEGENDARY ELEMENTS

old Prologue to Luke's Gospel.⁹⁰ Its anonymous author, in emphasizing Luke's eagerness to expound to the Greeks the mystery of Christ, and to protect them from being influenced by Jewish or pagan teachings, at the same time indirectly indicates that the Greeks were the principal subjects of his preoccupation, meaning that he preached to them. These first Prologues were dated by Corssen from the first third of the third century.⁹¹ Dom de Bruyne saw in them an anti-Marcionist tendency, and dated them from the second century. M. J. Lagrange,⁹² however, refusing to see in them any such tendency, dated them from the second half of the second century, before the year 170, suggesting that they bear a certain affinity to the Canon of Muratori,⁹³ which dates from the end of the second century. Recently, R. G. Heard,⁹⁴ who is more skeptical about the early origin of the Prologue, was inclined to date its present form from the third century; but it may incorporate, he says, "if not an earlier and purely biographical Prologue, at least earlier and very valuable biographical material." Without becoming deeply involved in the controversy, we may deduce from what has so

⁹⁰ See the edition of the Greek text and of its Latin translation, compared with the so-called "Monarchian" Prologue, by Dom de Bruyne, "Les plus anciens prologues latins des évangiles," *Revue bénédictine*, 40 (1928), pp. 196 seq. The English translation of the passages from the Greek Prologue made by R. G. Heard is particularly interesting for our purpose ("The Old Gospel Prologues," in *The Journal of Theological Studies*, 6 [1955], p. 7): "Luke is a Syrian of Antioch, a doctor by profession, who was a disciple of the apostle, and later followed Paul until his martyrdom. He served the Lord without distraction, unmarried, childless, and fell asleep at the age of 84 in Boeotia, full of the Holy Spirit.—When the Gospels were already in existence . . . impelled by the Holy Spirit he wrote this whole Gospel in the regions of Achaëa. He shows by means of the preface this very fact, that before him other Gospels had been written, and that it was necessary to set forth, for those of the Gentiles who believed, the accurate narrative of the dispensation, that they should not be distracted by the Jewish fables nor miss the truth through deception by heretical and vain fantasies . . ." Most of the Latin manuscripts of this Prologue read "Bithynia" for "Boeotia." A later version of the Greek text mentions Thebes of Boeotia as Luke's resting place. Cf. *infra* p. 214, footnote 96.

⁹¹ P. Corssen, *Monarchianische Prologe zu den vier Evangelien; ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Kanons, Texte und Untersuchungen*, 15 (Leipzig, 1896), pp. 17 seq., 63 seq.

⁹² In his recension of de Bruyne's study, *Revue biblique*, 38 (1929), pp. 115–121.

⁹³ M. J. Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Luc* (Paris, 1948), pp. xiii–xx. On the Fragment of Muratori cf. also the recent study by A. A. T. Ehrhardt, "The Gospels in the Muratorian Fragment," *op. cit.*, pp. 121–138.

⁹⁴ *Loc. cit.*, p. 11.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

far been established, that, according to the oldest known tradition, the true missionary of Achaëa was, after Paul, Luke. No trace is to be found in this tradition that Andrew engaged in missionary activities there.

This tradition is also reflected in a Coptic inscription of the sixth or seventh century, though based on a much older text, apparently more ancient than the Latin Prologue and independent of it.⁹⁵ A Greek original of the text was published by H. von Soden.⁹⁶

This Achaean version concerning Luke is further confirmed by Jerome,⁹⁷ although the latter, influenced by the *Acta Andreae*, believed that Andrew ended his career in Patras. These accounts lend an aspect of doubt concerning Andrew's activities in Achaëa.

All of these facts are important also for dating the original Acts of Andrew. They indicate that this work, which is responsible for the new tradition of Andrew's activity in Thrace and Greece and of his death in Patras, could not have been composed in the second century, but only after Origen at the end of the third century. Thus the dating proposed by Flamion seems confirmed.

Although the new tradition appealed to many, it was some time before it spread everywhere and was accepted without hesitation. We quoted above some of the early copies of the *Acta Andreae et Matthiae* and the *Acta Petri et Andreae* in which the new tradition cannot be detected, but this is understandable when it is recalled that both apocrypha were composed in Egypt.

This is not all, for yet another fourth-century document may be

⁹⁵ G. Lefebvre, "Égypte chrétienne, à propos de S. Luc," *Annales du service des antiquités*, 10 (1909), p. 1. Cf. M. J. Lagrange, *op. cit.*, p. xiii.

⁹⁶ Herrmann von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt*, 1 (Göttingen, 1913), p. 327. The Greek text gives as the place of Andrew's death not Bithynia—as can be read in most Latin manuscripts of the Prologue to Luke's Gospel,—but Boeotia. M. J. Lagrange, *op. cit.*, p. xvii, thinks that the mention of Thebes in Boeotia has been added to the Greek text after the transfer, by Constantius, of Luke's relics from Thebes to Constantinople. It seems probable, however, that in the Latin text the name of Boeotia was corrupted into Bithynia. For other interpretations see Th. Zahn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (3rd ed., Leipzig, 1924), pp. 340, 341, as indicated by him in *Das Evangelium des Lukas* (Leipzig, 1913), pp. 13-19, 738-745.

⁹⁷ In his commentary on St. Matthew: *Tertius Lucas medicus, natione Syrus Antiochensis, cuius laus in evangelio, qui et ipse discipulus apostoli Pauli, in Achaiae, Boeotiaeque partibus volumen condidit, quaedam altius repetens et, ut ipse in proemio confitetur, audita magis quam visa describens*; PL, 26, col. 18.

LEGENDARY ELEMENTS

cited which was written outside Greece—the Syriac *Doctrina Apostolorum*. Here again is discovered a faint reflection of the original tradition of Andrew's preaching in Asia Minor and on the northern shores of the Pontus, and although the reflection may already be weak, there is no allusion to Andrew in Achaea or Greece. On the contrary, these countries are said to have been evangelized by John and Luke.

First, when enumerating the letters written by the apostles which were kept with great reverence by their disciples and read in the churches, the compiler of the text says:⁹⁸ "They again [the successors of the apostles' disciples] at their deaths also committed and delivered to their disciples after them everything that they had received from the apostles; also what James had written from Jerusalem, and Simon from the city of Rome, and John from Ephesus, and Mark from the great Alexandria, and Andrew from Phrygia,⁹⁹ and Luke from Macedonia, and Judas Thomas from India."

Reviewing the missionary activity of the apostles, he writes:¹⁰⁰ "Ephesus and Thessalonica and all Asia and all the country of the Corinthians and all Achaea and its environs, received the Apostles' Hand of Priesthood from John the Evangelist, who had leaned upon the bosom of our Lord, and who built a Church there and ministered there in his office of Guide. Nicaea and Nicomedia and all the country of Bithynia and of Gothia, and of the regions round about it received the Apostle's Hand of Priesthood from Andrew, the brother of Simon Cephas, who was Guide and Ruler in the Church which he built there, and was Priest and ministered there. Byzantium and all the country of Thrace and its environs even to the great river, the border which separates the Barbarians, received the Apostle's Hand of Priesthood from Luke the Apostle, who built a Church there, and was Priest and ministered there in his office of Ruler and Guide."¹⁰¹

Flamion¹⁰² thought that "Thracia" should be substituted for

⁹⁸ W. Cureton, *Ancient Syriac Documents* (London, 1864), p. 32.

⁹⁹ Cf. E. Hennecke, *Handbuch*, p. 547, footnote 1.

¹⁰⁰ W. Cureton, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

¹⁰¹ Cf. the other versions of the *Doctrina Apostolorum* quoted by F. Haase in *Apostel und Evangelisten*, pp. 52–55, repeating the same tradition.

¹⁰² *Op. cit.*, p. 242.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

"Gothia" in the passage describing Andrew's missions. This, however, is impossible. This passage seems to have appeared strange to one copyist¹⁰³ who replaced "Gothia" with "Inner Galatia." But the word "Gothia" is perfectly correct. In the fourth century the Goths were already strongly entrenched in the Crimea, and stayed there even when their racial brothers had migrated toward the West. The Crimean Goths were christianized in the fourth century,¹⁰⁴ an event which must have excited the interest of the entire Eastern Christian world, and they remained loyally orthodox in spite of their racial brethren's acceptance of Arianism. With good reason, therefore, an echo of the original tradition that attributed Scythia to Andrew may be seen in this description of his activity. Also, the wording "Gothia and of the regions round about it," suggests the meaning: the Crimea and the Scythian lands around it. The distribution of Greek lands between John and Luke may seem strange; however, on one point the Syriac tradition of the fourth century is clear—it is unaware of Andrew's preaching in Thrace, Macedonia, or Achaea.

In Greek lands, however, and in the Latin West the new tradition concerning Andrew's preaching and martyrdom in Achaea began to spread in the second half of the fourth century. Gregory of Nazianzus¹⁰⁵ still seemed very much under the influence of the old tradition making Luke the Apostle of Achaea; so he assigned that country to Luke, and Epirus to Andrew. Also, Theodoret of Cyrus,¹⁰⁶ in the middle of the fifth century, mentioned "Hellas" as Andrew's missionary field, and Pseudo-Chrysostom¹⁰⁷ does the same.

In the West Gaudentius of Brescia¹⁰⁸ apparently knew of the new

¹⁰³ W. Cureton, *op. cit.*, p. 172: "Inner Galatia."

¹⁰⁴ Cf. G. Vernadsky, *Ancient Russia* (New Haven, 1943), p. 119. F. Dvornik, *Les Slaves, Byzance et Rome* (Paris, 1926), pp. 65, 144, 164; *idem*, *Légendes*, pp. 160 seq.

¹⁰⁵ *Oratio* 33, chap. 11, *PG*, 36, col. 228.

¹⁰⁶ In Psalm 116:1, *PG*, 80, col. 1805.

¹⁰⁷ *Homilia in duodecim apostolos*, *PG*, 59, col. 495.

¹⁰⁸ *Sermo* 17, *PL*, 20, col. 963: *Andreas et Lucas apud Patras Achaiae civitatem, consummati referuntur*. At that time Pope Damasus seems to have believed that Andrew had suffered martyrdom on the cross (*Carmen* 8, *PL*, 13, cols. 381 seq.), but Eucherius, Bishop of Lyon (d. ca. 450) still knew only the old tradition. In his *Instructionum libri duo*, 1 (*PL*, 50, col. 809) he says: *Andreas Scythas praedicatione movit*.

LEGENDARY ELEMENTS

version about 420, for he confesses to have heard that Andrew and Luke died at Patras in Achaea. St. Gregory the Great¹⁰⁹ seems also to have accepted this tradition when he attributed the conversion of Achaea to Andrew without mentioning Scythia.

Most remarkable is the case of St. Jerome. Although he certainly knew of the tradition, reported by Eusebius, of Andrew's preaching in Scythia, and although he knew that Luke was regarded as the principal Apostle of Achaea, he was so greatly influenced by the new Andrew tradition, which had spread through the circulation of the *Acta Andreae*, that he admits that Andrew preached in Achaea.¹¹⁰

The original tradition was, however, not forgotten. The Pseudo-Athanasius¹¹¹—in reality Basil of Seleucia—was much impressed by the *Acta Andreae et Matthiae*, as may be seen in his homily on St. Andrew, written about the year 459. He must have read this for he combines both traditions in his homily, and says that Andrew had "filled with grace not only Hellas, but also the lands of the barbarians." The later reports on Andrew's activity¹¹² combine the two traditions, and present Andrew as responsible for the penetration of Christianity into Scythia and Achaea. Both traditions are reflected also in Greek Synaxaries.¹¹³

When all this is taken into consideration, the tradition according to which Andrew journeyed from Pontus, by way of Thrace and

¹⁰⁹ *Homilia* 17 in *Evangel.* 17, *PL*, 76, col. 1148. Eucherius of Lyon, however, still followed the old tradition transmitted by Eusebius and his Latin translator Rufinus, and speaks only of Scythia as Andrew's missionary field (*Instructiones*, bk. 1, *CSEL*, 31, ed. C. Wotke, p. 135).

¹¹⁰ *Epist.* 59 ad Marcellam, 5, *CSEL*, 54, ed. I. Hildberg, p. 546: *In omnibus locis versabatur [Jesus] cum Thomas in India, cum Petro Romae, cum Paulo in Illyrico, cum Tito in Creta, cum Andrea in Achaia* (ed. J. Lebourt, *Collection Guillaume Budé*, 13 [Paris, 1953], p. 89). Cf. G. Grützmacher (*Hieronymus*, 1 [Leipzig, 1901], p. 99) who dates this letter from the year 394, and F. Cavallera (*Saint Jérôme, sa vie et son oeuvre*, 1 [Louvain, Paris, 1922], p. 167) who refers the letter to 395–396. See other minor writings in Th. Scherman's *Prophet. vitae fabulosae*, pp. 206–217. See J. Flamion, *op. cit.*, p. 32–38, on the growth of the Andrew cult in the West in the fifth century, after the apocryphal Acts of Andrew, translated into Latin, had prepared the terrain.

¹¹¹ *PG*, 28, col. 1108. Cf. *supra* p. 148. Cf. also Venantius Fortunatus, a contemporary of Gregory of Tours, in his *Carminum libri decem*, 8, *MGH, Auct. Antiq.*, 4, pt. 1, p. 185: *Nobilis Andream mittit Achaia suum*. *Ibid.*, 1, *op. cit.*, p. 7, Venantius praises Bishop Vitalis for having built the church of Andreas in Ravenna.

¹¹² See *supra*, pp. 174 seq.

¹¹³ Ed. H. Delehay, *Propylaeum ad Acta Sanctorum Novembris*, cols. 265 seq.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

Macedonia to Achaea, appears highly suspect, if not completely legendary. No less suspect is the story, first told in Pseudo-Epiphanius' catalogue and amplified by Pseudo-Dorotheus, of Andrew's stay in Byzantium. In the former Andrew preaches not in Byzantium, but in nearby Argyropolis. The *Narratio* and the Pseudo-Dorotheus impute the inability of the Apostle to preach in Byzantium to the fact that it was governed by a tyrant called Zeuxippus who imprisoned and put to death anyone who sought to preach Christianity there.

The name of Zeuxippus was always well known to the Byzantines. The *Chronicon Paschale*¹¹⁴ recounts that the Emperor Severus built in Byzantium a public bath which he wished to be called Severium, but which the natives called Zeuxippus because on the Tetrastoon, a place with four porticoes a short distance from the baths, there once stood a bronze statue of the sun god with the inscription "Zeuxippus." Severus had removed the statue to the temple of Apollo which he had constructed on the city's Acropolis.

The name of Zeuxippus seems to derive from the mythical story of Zeus Hippios. According to Hesychius of Miletus,¹¹⁵ Zeus tamed the horses of Diomedes in the holy grove of Hercules, located where the public bath was later built. Another explanation, in Eusebius' World Chronicle,¹¹⁶ mentions a King of Sikyon called "Zeuxippus," the twenty-first in the succession of its rulers, and connects him with the baths in Byzantium bearing that name. George Cedrenus,¹¹⁷ Syncellus,¹¹⁸ and Malalas¹¹⁹ also list Zeuxippus among Sicyon's rulers, though, according to them, he was preceded by twenty-six kings.

Such a legendary name naturally stimulated the imagination of

¹¹⁴ Ed. Bonn, I, p. 494, *PG*, 92, col. 649. Cf. C. D. Du Cange, *Historia Byzantina. Constantinopolis Christiana* (Paris, 1680), pp. 88-91. On the bath and its history see R. Janin, *Constantinople*, pp. 22, 215-217, 404-405.

¹¹⁵ *Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum*, ed. Th. Preger (Teubner, Leipzig, 1901), pp. 15 seq.

¹¹⁶ *Chronicon*, *GCS*, 24 (ed. R. Helm, 1913); Eusebius' works, 7, pt. 1, p. 62: 21 Zeuxippus, an. 31. *Quidam ad huius memoriam conservandam balneas Byzantium multo post tempore appellatas putant.* Cf. also *Chronicon*, *ibid.*, 39, Eusebius' works, 7, pt. 2, p. 162.

¹¹⁷ Ed. Bonn, p. 144.

¹¹⁸ Ed. Bonn, p. 287.

¹¹⁹ Ed. Bonn, p. 69.

LEGENDARY ELEMENTS

the people of Byzantium, and it is not surprising that Zeuxippus was given a place in their folklore. Because the name was connected with the history of Byzantium from pagan times, it was easy to make of him a persecutor of Christians, and the creators of the Andrew Legend could have had, therefore, little difficulty in finding a suitable name for a fictitious ruler of Byzantium in apostolic times, and, at the same time, in endowing their Legend with a semblance of verisimilitude.

The place called Argyropolis (Silver city) was also well known to the Byzantines, though it was called so only from the fifth century onward. It owes this name to the Patriarch Atticus (406-425) who, according to his contemporary Church historian, Socrates,¹²⁰ seems to have made a habit of renaming places. He gave this name to the suburb of Constantinople situated opposite Chrysopolis (Golden city), because he liked its beautiful site. The public found this clever correlation pleasing; so it was called Argyropolis from that time on.¹²¹

Can a satisfactory explanation be found for the origin of the story that the Apostle Andrew worked and died in Achaea? Lipsius¹²² advanced the theory that Andrew's Achaean mission represented a substitution of Greek Achaea for the Caucasian tribe of the Achaioi who lived on the Caucasian coast and who were the nearest neighbors of Scythia proper. This explanation found many adherents.¹²³

¹²⁰ *Hist. eccles.*, 7, 25; PG, 67, col. 796B: κατιδὼν οὖν ὁ Ἀττικὸς τὸν καταντικρὺ Χρυσόπολεις τόπον ὑπερτεπὴ τυγχάνοντα, πρέπειν ἔφη, τοῦτον Ἀργυρόπολιν ὀνομάζεσθαι, καὶ ῥηθεὶς ὁ λόγος, εὐθὺς τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν ἐκράτυνεν.

¹²¹ This evidence provides additional documentation for the dating of the legend of Zeuxippus and of Andrew's stay in Argyropolis. It could hardly have been invented in the fifth century, when it would have been easy to disprove it, and perhaps not even at the beginning of the sixth century. Some time had to elapse before the origin of the name was forgotten. But even here the plagiarist was obviously careful to use names which would give his story credibility. On the site of Argyropolis see R. Janin, *op. cit.*, p. 427. Cf. also Nicephorus' Church History (PG, 146, col. 1133).

¹²² *Op. cit.*, 1, p. 610.

¹²³ Among others, B. Zimmermann in his article on Andrew in *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, 1 (Paris, 1907), cols. 2031-2034. I. E. Hennecke (*op. cit.* [ed. 1904], p. 544) called this suggestion "ungeheuer" (monstrous) in the face of "einer zweifellos deutlichen Tradition" (a doubtlessly clear tradition). In his *Neutest. Apokr.* (2nd ed., Tübingen, 1924, p. 251), however, he stated frankly: "Ob für den Tod des Apostels in Patras in Sonderheit eine Lokaltradition bestand oder sich eine solche nur

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

This tribe was in fact well known in the classical period, especially in Greece. Strabo,¹²⁴ for example, says that "the Achaeans in the Pontus, as they are called, are a colony of Orchomenians who wandered there with Ialmenus after the capture of Troy." Pliny¹²⁵ also mentions the Achaeans, saying that they were divided into numerous tribal groups. Arrianus mentions them too in his *Periplus*,¹²⁶ written about A.D. 130–131.

Actually, although these Achaeans were often believed to have been Greeks from Phtiotic Achaea or from Orchomenus in Boeotia who founded a colony there, they had, in reality, nothing in common with the Greek Achaeans. Of interest, however, is the fact that this identification of Greek Achaeans with those of the Caucasian coast was an ancient one, recalled by Greek intellectuals even in the third century. It is, therefore, not impossible that the idea of their affinity gave to the author of the Acts of Andrew, who was familiar with the tradition that the Apostle had preached in Scythia, a country neighboring that of the Caucasian Achaeans, the thought that Andrew must also have preached to the Greek Achaeans.

There must, however, have been another incentive for associating Andrew so closely with Patras. It seems probable that in that city, the cult, of a local Saint with the same or a similar name had inspired a patriotic intellectual to identify him with the Apostle, and to supply what was wanting—a description of his martyrdom. Other apocrypha, especially the *Acta Petri* with which such a writer must have been familiar, provided him with the necessary pattern. Naturally, the Apostle had first to be conducted from his original mission, attested by the oldest tradition, in barbaric Scythia, through Hellenized Asia Minor and Thrace to Greece proper. The author wrote of this in the style of Greek romances,

auf einen Martyrer gleichlautenden oder ähnlichen Namens erstreckte, was dann für den Verfasser Anlass zu seiner Fabeldichtung geworden wäre, ist nicht auszumachen. [Whether there was a local tradition for the death of the Saint in Patras, or whether such a tradition concerned only a martyr of the same or similar name, which might have given the author cause for his fabrication cannot be determined]."

¹²⁴ *Op. cit.*, C 416, bk. 9, ch. 2, 42; ed. H. L. Jones, 4, *ibid.*, p. 340.

¹²⁵ *Op. cit.*, 6, sec. 30; ed. H. Rackham, 2, *ibid.*, p. 360.

¹²⁶ Arrianus, *Periplus Ponti Euxini*, *Geographi graeci minores*, 2, ed. C. Müller (Paris, 1882), p. 393.

LEGENDARY ELEMENTS

displaying, at the same time, his vast geographical knowledge so as to give to his fantasies the ring of authenticity. In the history of Andrew's brother, St. Peter, he found a very appealing prototype for Andrew's heroic martyrdom. Thus Andrew's story resembled that of his brother, even as to his death.

This instance of substituting for a local Saint a more famous one is not unique; witness the well-known case of St. Clement, third successor to St. Peter. In probably the fourth, or at the latest the beginning of the fifth, century a legend of St. Clement was published describing his miracles and sufferings when exiled by Trajan *ad marmora* in the Crimea, where he found two thousand Christian prisoners.¹²⁷ The body of the martyr was said to have been buried in the city of Cherson in a chapel near the sea. Although the story is wholly legendary, it was firmly believed and, by a curious coincidence, was made known in the West by the same St. Gregory of Tours¹²⁸ who had introduced the Andrew Legend there. When, about 861, St. Constantine-Cyril, Apostle of the Slavs, with his brother Methodius, stopped in Cherson on his way to the Khazars as Emperor Michael III's envoy, he had the good fortune to find the relics which were regarded as those of Pope Clement, and this gave new impetus to the widespread cult of the Saint. He brought the relics to Rome in 868, and Pope Hadrian II deposited them in the Church of St. Clement. It is most probable that a similar explanation must be accepted for the history of the relics of St. Andrew.

For the purposes of this investigation, it is irrelevant whether or not the story of Andrew's journey through Asia Minor, Thrace, and Macedonia to Greece proper is authentic. Two important points emerge from the present study: one, that Andrew's activity in Thrace and Byzantium had already been described in the original Acts at the end of the third century, if not earlier; and two, that from the fourth century onward it could have been regarded in Byzantium and elsewhere in the Christian world as historical fact.

¹²⁷ See for details and bibliography F. Dvornik, *Légendes*, pp. 190-197. See the "Life" in F. X. Funk, *Opera patrum apostolicorum*, 2 (Tübingen, 1881).

¹²⁸ *Libri octo miraculorum*, (*Liber in gloria martyrum*), MGH, *Script. Rev. Merov.*, 1, 35, ed. W. Arndt, Br. Krusch, pp. 510 seq.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

The story of the foundation by Andrew of the see of Byzantium could very well, therefore, have originated at the end of the third or in the fourth century. But, as far as can be judged from the reconstruction of the original Acts, it did not originate at that time. There is no mention of a prolonged stay by Andrew in Byzantium in the *Virtutes Andreae* (utilized in Gregory's *Miracula*) or in any other writing. Although all the necessary elements for its formation existed at this early period, the story did not originate then because no-one in Byzantium was yet aware of the importance of an apostolic foundation to a see in ecclesiastical organization. The significance to a see of such a foundation became fully appreciated, as has already been shown, during the sixth and seventh centuries; therefore the earliest permissible date for the first known codification of the legend of Andrew's founding of the Byzantine see can be set at the end of the seventh and the first half of the eighth centuries. This, however, does not mean that the legend did not circulate by word of mouth, and perhaps also in writing, for some time before that period. Every condition necessary to its origin existed throughout Byzantium from the time of Constantius at the latest.

All of this cautions us against excessive harshness toward the Byzantines for their creation of this Legend. Once it was accepted not only in the East, but also in the West—as we learn from the Latin *Virtutes Andreae* used by Gregory of Tours in his *Miracula*—that Andrew had visited Thrace and Byzantium, the Byzantines could regard themselves as perfectly entitled to attribute the foundation of their episcopal see to this Apostle. At the time of the origin of the Legend no-one in Byzantium or in the West hesitated to believe that Andrew had preached the Gospel in Scythia and in Achaia, and Thrace and Byzantium seemed the necessary links between his activities in those two areas.

CHAPTER SIX

THE GROWTH OF THE ANDREW LEGEND

Ninth-century writings propagating the Andrew and Stachys Legend — The *Laudatio*, the *Passio Artemii*, and their connection with the Andrew Legend — The *Laudatio* echoes some ideas of the Patriarch Photius — Nicetas the Paphlagonian and Ignatius the Deacon on Andrew and Stachys — Theophanes' critical attitude toward the Andrew Legend — Another source of Byzantium's apostolic character: Constantinople heir of Ephesus and of the Apostle John. Ignatius' and Photius' testimony — John's connection with Constantinople in Armenian and Nestorian tradition — The Patriarch Photius and the Andrew Legend — The Andrew tradition, one of the principal arguments in the opusculum against Roman primacy, falsely attributed to Photius — The ninth-century *Typicon* of Constantinople on Andrew, Stachys, and Metrophanes — Spread of the Andrew and Stachys Legend in the tenth century — Its acceptance by the Syrians and Georgians — The Andrew story in the Russian Primary Chronicle — Pseudo-Symeon's and Cedrenus' catalogue of Byzantine bishops.

The apostolic character of the see of Constantinople was, as we have seen, commonly accepted as a fact in Byzantium from the end of the seventh century onward. The belief that the episcopal see of Byzantium was founded by the Apostle Andrew started to spread at the end of the eighth century. It now remains to trace the growth of this tradition and to determine its role in the development of the Byzantine Church as affecting relations with other Churches, especially that of Rome.

In this connection, it is particularly important to review the spread of this legendary tradition in the ninth century.¹ The composition of Pseudo-Dorotheus' catalogue of the bishops of Byzantium has been shown to date from the beginning of the ninth century. The

¹ See *supra*, p. 173 seq.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

Andrew and Stachys Legend is also reflected in the list of apostles and seventy disciples, which was falsely ascribed to Hippolytus of Rome.² In reality, this list was a ninth-century compilation based on the catalogue of Pseudo-Dorotheus.³ Its existence was revealed for the first time by George the Monk,⁴ who quoted from it when describing the Life of St. John the Apostle in his chronicle written about the year 866. A long series of similar lists originated in the following period, based on the texts of Pseudo-Epiphanius, Pseudo-Dorotheus, and Pseudo-Hippolytus.⁵ They are, however, of little value for this investigation.

The story of the foundation of the see of Byzantium by Andrew found a most effective propagandist in the author of the *Chronographikon syntomon*, a short chronological compilation, presenting simply a list of emperors, of Jewish and Persian kings, and of bishops of the five patriarchates. In his enumeration of the patriarchs of Constantinople, the author copied from Pseudo-Dorotheus not only the Andrew and Stachys stories, but also the complete list of bishops of Byzantium who were believed to have preceded Metrophanes.

This compilation is regarded as a work of the Patriarch Nicephorus (806–815). Only a revised edition of the work dating from 850 is extant⁶ and, for that reason, some hesitate to ascribe it to the Patriarch. The opusculum became a very popular handbook of general history, which was often copied and which appeared in several "revised editions," with additions, down to as late as 976.

About 870 this work came into the hands of a western scholar—Anastasius, the Librarian (*Bibliothecarius*) of the Roman see. He made use of it in his *Historia tripartita*,⁷ which was based on Theophanes' historical work, but he carefully omitted the lists of the patriarchs.

² PG, 10, cols. 952–956.

³ Th. Schermann, "Propheten und Apostellegenden nebst Jüngerkatalogen des Dorotheus und verwandter Texte," *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, 31 (Leipzig, 1907), pp. 153 seq., 292, 353.

⁴ Ed. de Boor, 2, pp. 447, 448.

⁵ Th. Schermann, *op. cit.*, pp. 165 seq.

⁶ Ed. Bonn, pp. 771 seq. Ed. de Boor, pp. 112 seq. Cf. K. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der Byzantinischen Literatur* (Munich, 1897), pp. 350 seq.

⁷ Theophanes, *Chronographia*, 2, ed. de Boor (Leipzig, 1885), pp. 31–552.

GROWTH OF THE ANDREW LEGEND

More interesting than these lists are two lives of the Apostle Andrew which appeared in the ninth century, and some passages on him found in other hagiographical works. The Life of St. Andrew, composed by Epiphanius, monk of the monastery of Callistratos in Constantinople, deserves particular attention.⁸ A basis for dating its composition is to be found in two of its passages. In one of them the author says that he had to leave his monastery in order to avoid association with the iconoclasts,⁹ and that he visited all the places where Andrew had preached, which indicates that he must have read the original apocryphal Acts of the Apostle in order to collect material for his work. In the other passage, when describing Andrew's activity in Sinope, Epiphanius speaks¹⁰ of an episode about which he had been told by the natives: During the regime of Constantine Copronymus (741-775) some iconoclasts had tried in vain to destroy a marble effigy of Andrew erected near the city. It can be inferred from the context that Epiphanius visited Sinope and the local relics of Andrew's activity some time after the unsuccessful attempt at the destruction of the effigy. Because he says himself that he left his monastery in order to avoid contact with the iconoclasts, it is safe to date his departure from Callistratos in 815, when Leo V inaugurated the second phase of the iconoclastic movement in Byzantium. He must, then, have written his work about the middle of the ninth century, when he had been able to return to his monastery after the victory of the image-worshippers.

Epiphanius confesses that the main source for his writings was the catalogue of apostles and disciples wrongly attributed to Epiphanius of Cyprus. However, in describing Andrew's missionary activity, he improves on his source by substituting for the word "Ethiopians"—the general designation for peoples in the "hinterland" of Colchis—the names of some of the nations comprising this general title, i.e. the Iberians, the Soussians, the Phoustes and the Alans.¹¹

⁸ PG, 120, cols. 218-260. On the monastery see R. Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin*, 3 (Paris, 1953), pp. 285 seq. Epiphanius' work was first published by A. Dressel, *Epiphaniî monachi et presbyteri edita et inedita* (Paris, Leipzig, 1843), pp. 45 seq.

⁹ PG, 120, col. 221C.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, col. 220B.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, col. 221B.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

On Andrew's activity in Byzantium he reports:¹² "And in this way establishing the Churches, he arrived at Byzantium. Argyropolis was then flourishing. He appointed Stachys Bishop of this city, and dedicated on the acropolis of Byzantium a sanctuary, which exists today, to the Holy Mother of God. Then, leaving there, he journeyed to Heracleia of Thrace, but departed after staying there some days. Wandering through the cities of Macedonia, teaching, exhorting, and healing, founding Churches, dedicating altars, and anointing priests, he came as far as the Peloponnese and Patras under the proconsulate of Aegeates."

It is interesting to note that Epiphanius neglects to mention Zeuxippus, the legendary ruler of Byzantium, who is reputed, in the *Narratio* and in Pseudo-Dorotheus to have persecuted the Christians. This could be taken as an indication that here he followed Pseudo-Epiphanius who also speaks only of Argyropolis. Epiphanius' statement, however, about the founding by Andrew of a church on the acropolis of Byzantium, seems to suggest the existence there of a tradition attributing to Andrew the building of such a church dedicated to Our Lady. Thus it is possible that, in trying to combine the two traditions, Epiphanius had to eliminate Zeuxippus from his account.

Epiphanius' writings were the principal source of another composition in honor of the Apostle—an anonymous panegyric published by Bonnet,¹³ and generally called the *Laudatio*. In the manuscripts it bears the following title: "Acts and Travels of the holy and illustrious Apostle Andrew, recorded in the Form of a Homily." The anonymous author recalls the travels of the Apostle in the same way as does Epiphanius, and also omits the story of Zeuxippus, contenting himself with the account of Stachys' ordination as Bishop in Argyropolis, and of the erection of a church on Byzantium's acropolis by Andrew.

It seems established that, contrary to Lipsius' opinion,¹⁴ the *Laudatio*'s only source was Epiphanius' Life of Andrew. Its author

¹² *Ibid.*, col. 244C,D.

¹³ *Supplementum codicis apocryphi, Acta Andreae* (Paris, 1889), pp. 1-44; *Analecta Bollandiana*, 13, pp. 309-352.

¹⁴ *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten, und Apostellegenden*, 1, pp. 571 seq.,

GROWTH OF THE ANDREW LEGEND

did not know the original Acts of Andrew from which Epiphanius derived much of his information.¹⁵ A perusal of both texts gives the impression that the *Laudatio* is but another edition, abridged, emended, and polished, of Epiphanius' work. In spite of his boastful introduction, Epiphanius produced rather a poor compilation which, in both composition and style, leaves much to be desired. It could be that the author of the *Laudatio* was a monk from the same monastery of Callistratos, which could explain why he uses Epiphanius' work so freely. It would have been in the monastery's interest for Epiphanius' compilation to reappear in a more elegant form.

Only the introduction to the *Laudatio* and its final chapter are original and deserve our special attention. At the end of his panegyric the author recalls the transfer of Andrew's relics from Patras to the Church of the Holy Apostles in Constantinople. For this deed he praises Constantius who had charged Artemius, one of his officers, with the direction of the mission.¹⁶ Artemius is said to have suffered martyrdom under Julian the Apostate.

In this particular detail the paneygrists' source is the Life of Artemius, written by the monk John of Rhodes. It is known that Artemius was an Arian, and that he was executed by Julian because of his intimate relationship with Constantius and his participation in the murder of Julian's brother Gallus. The legend elevated Artemius to the rank of a martyr consequent to his having been put to death because of his anti-pagan zeal during his governorship of Alexandria, and because of his bold opposition to Julian. In his praise of the "martyr," John of Rhodes was inspired mainly by the Arian Church historian Philostorgius.¹⁷

585. F. Diekamp, *Hippolytos von Theben. Texte und Untersuchungen* (Münster i. W., 1898), pp. 143 seq., accepted Lipsius' idea, but admitted that the author of the *Laudatio* also used Epiphanius' work.

¹⁵ J. Flamion, *Les actes apocryphes de l'Apôtre André*, pp. 205 seq.

¹⁶ *Supplementum*, pp. 42 seq., *AnBoll.*, 13, chaps. 51-54, pp. 350 seq.

¹⁷ See J. Bidez, "Philostorgius Kirchengeschichte," *GCs*, 21 (Leipzig, 1913), pp. lviii seq., 31 seq.; *Passio S. Artemii*, PG, 96, cols. 1265 seq. (chaps. 16, 17, 18). John also followed Philostorgius in attributing the construction of the church of the Holy Apostles not to Constantine, but to his son Constantius. A strong echo of this Constantius tradition is also to be found in the *Laudatio*. Its author followed John of Rhodes in attributing to Constantius not only the transfer of the relics, but also the construction

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

It would be of great help toward the exact dating of the *Laudatio* if the date of composition of the *Passio Artemii* could be determined with more certainty. P. Batiffol,¹⁸ who first drew the attention of specialists to the importance of this *Passio* for the reconstruction of Philostorgius' Church History, dated the composition of the *Passio* from the ninth century. Krumbacher also counted John of Rhodes among the hagiographers of that age.¹⁹

Batiffol examined the problem more thoroughly in his doctoral thesis,²⁰ and came to the conclusion that the Life was written between 830 and 850. However, his principal argument—that it must have been composed before the reign of Basil I (867–886) because the *Menologion* of Basil derives its description of Artemius' martyrdom from John's work—is inadequate. It has since been shown that the *Menologion*, which is rather a *Synaxarion*, was composed in the reign of Basil II (976–1025).²¹

J. Bidez,²² who used John's work for his reconstruction of Philostorgius' Church History, forbore examining the question, and contented himself with the statement that the *Passio* existed in the tenth century because Symeon Metaphrastes²³ made much use of John's composition in his description of Artemius' martyrdom.

Bidez discovered the existence of an older account of Artemius' passion²⁴ which was unknown to Batiffol, but used by John of Rhodes, and which could have been written soon after the seventh

of the church of the Holy Apostles. It is interesting to see that this Constantian tradition, abandoned by many Byzantine authors after Philostorgius, who attributed the construction of the church and the transfer of the relics to Constantine, reappears here in a work of the ninth century. On this problem cf. G. Downey, "The Builder of the Original Church of the Holy Apostles at Constantinople," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 6 (1951), pp. 51–80. Cf. *supra*, chap. 4, p. 139.

¹⁸ "Fragmente der Kirchengeschichte des Philostorgius," *Römische Quartalschrift*, 3 (1889), pp. 252–289 (on John of Rhodes, pp. 252–257).

¹⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 199, 523.

²⁰ *Quaestiones Philostorgianae* (Paris, 1891), pp. 35–39.

²¹ See for details S. Der Nersessian, "Remarks on the Date of the Menologium and the Psalter written for Basil II," *Byzantion*, 15 (1940–1941), pp. 104–125.

²² *Op. cit.*, p. xlv.

²³ *PG*, 115, cols. 1160–1212. It is noteworthy that in col. 1169B Metaphrastes resolutely attributes the construction of the church of the Holy Apostles to Constantianus. This is new evidence that the "Constantian tradition" regarding this church did not disappear in Byzantium.

²⁴ *Op. cit.*, pp. 166–176.

GROWTH OF THE ANDREW LEGEND

century.²⁵ This dating seems particularly sound because the uncouth language and style of the *Passio* point to a period when Byzantine literary activity had reached a very low level, and this was certainly the case in the seventh century when the Empire was fighting for its very survival.

This older *Passio Artemii* depicts Artemius as having been put to death in Antioch because of the courage with which he had opposed Julian's treatment of two priests of that city, and this suggests an explanation for the origin of the cult of Artemius in Byzantium. Apparently, at least until the ninth century, the Byzantines, conscious of Artemius' heretical inclinations, recognized two persons of this name, both of whom died under Julian; one as a martyr in Antioch, later regarded and venerated as a great worker of miracles, the other executed on the Emperor's order, principally for political expediency. The belief that there were two Artemii appeared to be corroborated by the Arian historiographer, whose report is preserved in the *Chronicon Paschale*.²⁶

Although praising Artemius' zeal for the Church, Philostorgius does not regard his execution as a martyrdom. The passage from the *Chronicon* was copied, too, by the chronicler Theophanes²⁷ who died

²⁵ Dating from the same period is a "Collection of Miracles" wrought by Artemius in Constantinople, in the church of Oxeia, where he was buried. It was published by A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus in *Varia sacra graeca (Zapiski istor. filol. fakulteta imp. S. Peterburgsk. universiteta)*, 95 [St. Petersburg, 1909], pp. 1-79. Cf. H. Delehaye, "Les recueils antiques de miracles des saints," *AnBoll*, 43 (1925), pp. 32-38. On Artemius' cult cf. P. Maas, "Artemioskult in Konstantinopel," *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher*, 1 (1920), pp. 377-380; K. Lehmann, "Ein Reliefbild des heiligen Artemios in Konstantinopel," *ibid.*, pp. 381-384; N. A. Bees, "Weiteres zum Kult des hl. Artemios," *ibid.*, pp. 384, 385. On his cult among the Armenians cf. Bidez, *op. cit.* pp. xlvii seq., lxiii seq. Cf. also J. Tolstoi "Un poncif arétologique dans les miracles d'Asklepios et d'Artemios" in *Byzantion*, 3 (1926), pp. 53-63. The "Collection of Miracles" contains much that is of considerable interest with regard to Constantinople's topography and Byzantine folklore. Cf. N. H. Baynes, "Topographica Constantinopolitana," *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 31 (1911), pp. 266-268; R. Janin, "Etudes de topographie byzantine," *Echos d'Orient*, 36 (1937), pp. 303 seq.

²⁶ Ed. Bonn, p. 549; J. Bidez, *op. cit.*, p. 234.

²⁷ Ed. Bonn, ad. ann. 5855, p. 79. De Boor, however, p. 51, gives: ἡλὸν πολὺν κατὰ τῶν εἰδῶλων ἐνεδείξατο ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ, ἐδημεύθη. Because Theophanes takes this information from the *Chronicon Paschale*, which states emphatically that the punishment of the Arian Artemius took place ἐν τῇ Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ, it would be advisable to place the comma after ἐνεδείξατο, as did the previous editor of Theophanes. This reading strengthens the

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

in 818. The Church historian Theodoret,²⁸ although mentioning Artemius' zeal against paganism, is also silent on his canonization.

All of this may have contributed to the origin of the distinction between the two men of the same name who died on orders from Julian. John of Rhodes, however, put a definite end to such distinctions when he again promoted the Arian Artemius to the rank of a great saint and worker of miracles. His new description of Artemius' martyrdom gave fresh impulse to the expansion of the Artemius cult.

It has been seen that Theophanes obtained his information on Artemius from the *Chronicon Paschale*, whose author derived it from Philostorgius. This would indicate that Theophanes did not know John's *Passio Artemii*. The latter could have written his work only after 818, probably about the year 843 when the victory over iconoclasm had given a new impetus to hagiographical activity. This supposition is substantiated by the fact that the *Typicon* of the Church of Constantinople, which was in use in the ninth century and is preserved in a tenth-century manuscript of Patmos, already gives some details concerning the feast of St. Artemius on October 20th that are not found in the old *Passio*, but that can be read in the work of John of Rhodes.²⁹ A similar description was

supposition that the Byzantines distinguished this Artemius, executed in Alexandria, from an imaginary Artemius who was executed in Antioch, as the old *Passio* has it. On Artemius' execution see, W. Ensslin, "Kaiser Julians Gesetzgebungswerk und Reichsverwaltung," *Klio*, 18 (1922-1923), p. 162. The author accepts the probability that, as set forth in the *Chronicon Paschale*, the historical Artemius was executed in Alexandria.

²⁸ *Historia ecclesiastica*, 3, 18; *GCS*, 19, ed. L. Parmentier, p. 197.

²⁹ A. Dmitrijevskij, *Opisanie liturgiĭeskikh rukopisej*, 1, *Typika* (Kiev, 1895), pp. 14 seq.: καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ τοῦ θαυματουργοῦ μάρτυρος Ἀρτεμίου ἐπὶ Ἰουλιανοῦ τοῦ παραβάτου, δούξ καὶ αὐγουστάλιος Ἀλεξανδρείας γεγωνῶς καὶ πατρικίος διαπρέψας ἐν διαφόροις ἀξιώμασιν ἀπὸ Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως. The old *Passio* does not call Artemius *augustalis*, and it ignores his promotion by Constantine the Great. We learn this from John of Rhodes, who says that Artemius was a member of the Senate under Constantine, and a favorite at Constantine's court (*PG*, 96, col. 1256). N. Th. Krasnosel'cev ("Tipik cerkvi sv. Sofii v Konstantinopole IX v.," in *Letopis istoriko-filolog. obščestva pri imper. Novorossijskom universitete, Vizantijskoe otdelenie*, 1 [Odessa, 1892]) has shown that this *Typicon* was composed in Constantinople during the ninth century, and was in use in Hagia Sophia from the end of that century on. I have used only D. Beljaev's review of Krasnosel'cev's study, in *Žurnal Ministersta narodnago prosvěščeniia* (St. Petersburg, October, 1892), pp. 363-379.

GROWTH OF THE ANDREW LEGEND

introduced into the *Synaxaria*,³⁰ and into the *Menologion* of Basil II.³¹

Thus it is reasonable to conclude that the *Laudatio*, whose author read John's work and made use of it, was written after 843. However, the manner in which the *Laudatio*'s author paraphrases John's description of the transfer of the relics of St. Andrew, Luke, and Timothy to Constantinople, and some details contained in the introduction, may help to date this composition even more accurately.

When describing the transfer of the relics by Artemius, the author of the *Laudatio* calls Constantinople "the great city, New Rome, Queen of cities," henceforth to be protected by the apostles whose relics reposed in its midst.³²⁻³³ These words were apparently written at a time when the Byzantines were fully aware of the importance of their city in the Church and were emphasizing its importance, and this sentiment seems to have prevailed in Constantinople during the second half of the ninth century when they were defending the rights of their Church against the papacy in the Photian and Ignatian conflict.

In other respects the *Laudatio* points even more clearly to that period, especially in its eulogy of St. Peter in the introduction, and in its bringing together of Peter and Andrew, who are exalted as the greatest of all apostles to whom the Lord had entrusted the whole West and East, and who are united by brotherly love.

The words of praise addressed to Peter, whom Andrew had introduced to Christ, are particularly impressive. After narrating how Andrew was invited by the Lord to become his disciple, the author stresses Andrew's haste to share this joy and honor with his brother Peter:³⁴ "He, the first-called initiate, or rather self-called servant, leads to the Lord of all the disciple who was to fill the first throne and [to become] the worthy holder of the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. Immediately accepted as an intimate and genuine friend,

³⁰ H. Delehay, *Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, cols. 151 seq.

³¹ PG. 117, col. 117.

³²⁻³³ M. Bonnet, *Acta Andreae, Supplementum*, p. 42; *AnBoll*, 13, p. 350 (chap. 51).

³⁴ *Op. cit.*, ed. M. Bonnet, *ibid.*, p. 6; *AnBoll*. 13, p. 314 (chap. 3).

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

he rejects the family name he had received at birth, and is renamed with a name fitting the circumstances, being called Cephas, as Peter is interpreted, the most steadfast and most excellent of Christ's disciples, verily the rock of the truly unbroken faith, he who carries on himself the newly-founded Church, and who preserves it unconquerable by the gates of Hell. Thus this chosen dyad and pair of disciples become intimately attached to the Saviour by selection, the brotherly pair called worthy to be the first fruits of the human race and the supreme heads of the apostolic company. It was necessary, indeed, for the almighty and all-powerful God the Word, who for the salvation of the world, became Man, to take such collaborators and assistants, the one adorned with appropriate manliness in word and deed, the other revered for the firmness expressed by his name once he became the unbroken foundation of the Church."

No less impressive are some passages in the *Laudatio* in which the author stresses the perfect unity and fraternal love between the two brothers, giving precedence to Peter, but emphasizing at the same time Andrew's prominent place among the twelve apostles. When speaking of the countries allotted to each apostle for preaching, he says:³⁵ "The coryphaeus of all, Peter, obtained by lot, through the decision of the divine love, the western lands of the setting sun, that were without light to lighten them, and his companion, his brother Andrew, the eastern parts, to illuminate [them] with the word of God-fearing preaching."

A little further on the panegyrist exalts the bonds of kinship uniting the two Apostles, who were brothers "not only by nature and by physical birth, but also by the choice of their vocation, and by their fraternal thoughts."³⁶ They first preached together in Antioch and in Asia Minor, and when the writer describes their separation³⁷ he gives the impression that the whole world was divided between them; Peter becoming Apostle of the whole West, and Andrew of the whole East.

The ardent praise which the author addresses to St. Peter in

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 7, *AnBoll*, p. 315 (chap. 4).

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 8; *AnBoll*, 13, p. 316 (chap. 6).

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 10; *AnBoll*, 13, pp. 318 seq. (chap. 9).

GROWTH OF THE ANDREW LEGEND

the introduction persuaded Flamion³⁸ to date the composition of the *Laudatio* in the beginning or middle of the ninth century. He saw there "un écho de ces retours de l'Orient à Rome, que la résistance à l'hérésie iconoclaste suscita et multiplia, avant la venue de la brouille et de la séparation."

If, however, these words are examined in the light of recent findings on the Photian schism, they seem rather to date from the years around 880, when Rome and Constantinople were reconciled once more, and when the Patriarch Photius was anxious to promote union and good understanding between East and West. This desire is expressed by the panegyrist's insistence on the brotherly unanimity of the two Apostles, one the founder of the Roman, and the other the founder of the Byzantine see. In spite of the stress on the prominent position of Andrew among the apostles, the superior position of Peter, even in respect to Andrew, is clearly recognized. All this falls in with the thinking that prevailed in Byzantium after 880.

Similar appreciations of Peter, the coryphaeus of the apostles, are to be found in several writings of Photius.³⁹ It should be remembered that the classical argument in favor of the papal primacy (Matt. 16:18), which is alluded to in the *Laudatio*, was left almost intact in the doctored Greek version of John VIII's letter to the Emperor Basil I, read during the Council of 879-880.⁴⁰ Moreover,

³⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 85.

³⁹ For example *Photii Epistolae*, PG, 101, col. 1909; 102, cols. 661, 686, 764. *Ad Amphilochium*, PG, 101, cols. 308, 309, 324, 729, 933; *Homiliae*, ed. Aristarchis, I (Constantinople, 1901), pp. 481, 482; 2, p. 151; *Contra Manichaeos*, I, PG, 102, col. 92; *Bibliotheca*, PG, 104, col. 328.

⁴⁰ See F. Dvornik, *The Photian Schism*, pp. 182 seq. It is hard to understand why, in spite of this evidence, F. Dölger, in a reprint of his study "Rom in der Gedankenwelt der Byzantiner" in his *Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt* (Speyer a. R., 1953), p. 103 (the paper was first published in the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 56 [1937]) continues to maintain that "Photios die den Primat Roms betreffenden Stellen in der Tat absichtlich unterdrückt und das Konzil irregeführt hat." It is true that "the original text is more explicit in its proclamation of the Roman primacy, but the Greek text does sufficient justice to the Pope's leading idea" (F. Dvornik, *loc. cit.* See especially the quotations from the Greek version translated on pp. 183, 184 where there is a clear allusion to Matt. 16:18). This passage impressed even M. Jugie who gave it particular emphasis in his study "Photius et la primauté de Saint Pierre et du pape," *Bessarione*, 23 (1919), p. 130. Cf. also quotations of other Photius declarations favorable to the papal primacy collected by Jugie (*ibid.*, pp. 123-130); 24 (1920), pp. 46-55.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

despite his deference toward Rome, the panegyrist's words echo the same Byzantine self-consciousness and the same determination to defend Byzantium's rights, vis-à-vis Rome, in the direction of its affairs as is manifested in the Greek versions of papal letters sent to the Council of 879-880, and in the discussions held during the second and third session of that Council.⁴¹

It seems, moreover, that the monastery of Callistratos was one of the strongholds of the Photianists. At least, when, in 865-866, Photius was seeking a suitable man to administer the monastery of Studios, after the promotion of Theodore Santabareus to Metropolitan of Euchaita, he chose his disciple Sabas, who was a monk in the monastery of Callistratos.⁴² The monastery of Studios figured prominently in the Photian controversy for its Abbot Nicholas, together with two monks, had left the monastery in protest against Photius' election to the patriarchal see.⁴³ Photius needed a reliable man to govern such a place, and it is significant that he chose a monk from Callistratos. If the author of the *Laudatio* was also a monk in that monastery, he would more naturally reflect in his work the ideas of the Patriarch whose cause was warmly supported there.

Epiphanius' Life of Andrew was also used by the protagonists of the Ignatian party and by the relentless opponent of the Patriarch Photius, Nicetas the Paphlagonian. In his panegyric on St. Andrew, Nicetas, a firm believer in the Andrew and Stachys stories, has the Apostle preach to the "Iberians, Sauromatai, Tauroi, and Scythians, and to all regions and cities on the northern and southern coast of the *Pontus Euxeinus*."⁴⁴ Then he describes how Andrew founded a church of Our Lady on the acropolis of Byzantium and how he ordained "the great Stachys" Bishop of the city.⁴⁵ It should be stressed that although Nicetas speaks with great respect of the first

⁴¹ Mansi, 17, cols. 396 seq. (*MGH, Epist.* 7, pp. 166 seq., 420 seq., 476 seq.). See F. Dvornik, *op. cit.*, pp. 182-186, 191 seq., 434.

⁴² *Vita S. Nicolai Studitae*, *PG*, 105, col. 912.

⁴³ C. van de Vorst, "La Vie de St. Évariste, higoumène à Constantinople," *AnBoll.*, 41 (1923), pp. 306 seq.

⁴⁴ *PG*, 105, cols. 64, 68.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, cols. 68, 69.

GROWTH OF THE ANDREW LEGEND

Apostle in his panegyric on Peter and Paul,⁴⁶ a tendency, similar to that of the *Laudatio*, toward emphasizing the prominent position of Andrew at the side of Peter can be detected in his panegyric on Andrew. He boldly called Andrew "Peter after Peter."⁴⁷

The biographer of the Patriarch St. Tarasius (784–806), Deacon Ignatius, was also a firm believer in the apostolic character of the see of Constantinople, and in its foundation by St. Andrew. His literary activity, too, should be dated from the beginning of the second half of the ninth century. Here Ignatius clearly professes the same doctrine as does Theodore of Studios⁴⁸ concerning the authority of the five patriarchs over the Church. This, of course, indicates that he was attributing to the see of Constantinople the same apostolic character as to the other four patriarchal sees.

In this respect, however, when speaking of the convocation of the Seventh Oecumenical Council, which was the second of Nicaea, Ignatius seems to distinguish between the patriarch of the "Imperial City" and the other four apostolic sees.⁴⁹ But through his linking of the patriarch of Constantinople to the other four patriarchs, Ignatius evidently wanted to illustrate the special status held by Tarasius during that Council, and to show that, for the Empress Irene, Tarasius presided over the meetings and directed the debates.

This is confirmed by what he says at the end of his work when he compares his hero to the Apostle Andrew:⁵⁰ "He was so akin to and—through the similarity of the conduct of his life—so united with Andrew, who was the first to be called 'Apostle,' that he obtained possession of his pastoral see, which after so many centuries, was considerably augmented."

In his *Life of the Patriarch Nicephorus*, Ignatius is less outspoken. He does not mention Andrew, but it can be deduced from some of his expressions that he attributed an apostolic character to the see of Constantinople similar to that which he had attributed to the

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, cols. 37–53.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, col. 64B,C: Σὺ δέ μοι, σεβασμιώτατε Ἀνδρέα, ἀξιόθερον πρᾶγμα, τὸ τῆς ἀληθινῆς ἀνδρίας ὑπόδειγμα, ὃ τῆς καρτερίας ἀδάμας, ὃ τῆς ὑπομονῆς ἀνδρίας, ἢ μετὰ τὴν πέτραν πέτρα.

⁴⁸ Ignatius Diaconus, *Vita Tarasii*, ed. I. A. Heikel, *Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae*, 17 (Helsinki, 1889), p. 398. *Acta Sanct.*, Feb. 25, p. 583.

⁴⁹ Ed. I. A. Heikel, pp. 404, 405; *A.S.*, pp. 583, 586, 587.

⁵⁰ Ed. I. A. Heikel, p. 417; *A.S.*, p. 592.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

other four patriarchates.⁵¹ It should be noted particularly that he has Nicephorus use the authority of the apostolic sees in his discussion with the Emperor.⁵² The reverent eulogy paid to Peter is also noteworthy.⁵³

Nicephorus, himself, seems also to have believed in the apostolic character of his see. In his Apology for picture-worship⁵⁴ there is a very interesting passage on the Seventh Oecumenical Council. This Council was the highest authority because it was convoked according to the rules to be observed on such occasions. Old Rome was eminently represented there, and without its representation no doctrine could ever have been defined and approved, "because [it] possessed the primacy of the priesthood and owed this distinction to the two coryphaei of the apostles."

Then, in an interesting attempt to synthesize the principle of apostolicity and that of adaptation to the division of the Empire, Nicephorus stresses the part which Byzantium played at the Council: "the New Rome, the city which dominates in our parts, and which is the first one, a distinction it owes to the imperial majesty." He then mentions the apostolic sees—meaning Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem—but he seems to include his see also among those of apostolic character in the following statement: "It is a Church law from old times that, when any doubts or controversies arise in God's Church, they are solved and defined by oecumenical synods, with the consensus and approval of bishops in possession

⁵¹ He speaks of the "apostolic authority" of Nicephorus, of his "apostolic and paternal sanctions." The synodal letter with the profession of faith should have been sent, according to an old custom, to all apostolic sees. *Vita Nicephori*, PG, 100, cols. 72B, 156C, 73A; ed. de Boor (Leipzig, 1880), pp. 159, 29; 216, 3; 161, 2.

⁵² *Ibid.*, col. 89; ed. de Boor, p. 171: "Rome, the most important of apostolic sees . . . , Alexandria, the venerable shrine of the Evangelist Mark . . . , Antioch, also the most celebrated see of Peter, the coryphaeus of the apostles . . . , Jerusalem, the sublime dwelling of God's brother . . ." Cf. also a similar passage, *ibid.*, col. 124A; ed. de Boor, p. 194, 20 seq. The idea of the pentarchy is implied in Ignatius' criticism of the iconoclastic synod which is without value because the representatives of the apostolic sees were not present (*ibid.*, col. 136B; ed. de Boor, p. 202, 16).

⁵³ Comparing Nicephorus to Peter, Paul, and other Apostles, PG, col. 152B; ed. de Boor, pp. 212 seq.: Πέτρον τοῦ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας προβόλου τὸ μεγαλοφύες καὶ θερμὸν περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἐπιδειξάμενος . . .

⁵⁴ *Apologeticus pro sacris imaginibus*, PG, 100, col. 597A,B,C. Cf. also *ibid.*, cols. 576A, 621D, a very eloquent eulogy of St. Peter.

GROWTH OF THE ANDREW LEGEND

of apostolic sees." This provides also a strong echo of the pentarchic theory.

However, there must still have been some misgivings in Constantinople in the ninth century about the Andrew and Stachys Legend, especially among the more critical minds acquainted with older historical writings. Among these was St. Theophanes (d. 818), whose Chronicle, written about 810–811, followed strictly the tradition established by Socrates, and opened the series of bishops of Constantinople with Metrophanes.⁵⁵

Theophanes' attitude is the more remarkable in that he speaks in another passage of Dorotheus, Bishop of Tyre, and not only attributes to him many Greek and Latin writings, but stresses among these "a diligent treatise on the bishops of Byzantium and many other places." Theophanes evidently had in mind the famous Catalogue of Pseudo-Dorotheus,⁵⁶ but in spite of this does not mention any bishop of Byzantium before Metrophanes, whom he calls the first Bishop of that city. This is particularly noteworthy because he names all of the bishops of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem from the time of Diocletian, although the last three cities were not imperial residences. Theophanes failed to use the list of Pseudo-Dorotheus, therefore, not—as some think—because Byzantium was elevated to the status of a residential city only when Metrophanes became Bishop under Constantine, but rather because he regarded a catalogue of Byzantine bishops that started with Metrophanes as more authentic.

Theophanes' example is followed by the anonymous author of the *Chronographeion syntomon*. This work, falsely attributed to Eusebius, was composed in 854, and is based mainly on an unknown source from the time of the Patriarch Nicephorus.⁵⁷ It contains a list of

⁵⁵ Theophanes, *Chronographia*, ad. ann. 5799; ed. Bonn, p. 19; ed. de Boor, I, p. 16.

⁵⁶ Ed. Bonn, ad. ann. 5816, p. 35; ed. de Boor, 24. Cf. Th. Schermann, "Prophet. und Apost.", *op. cit.*, pp. 175 seq. Thus it seems that in 810–811 the catalogue of Byzantine bishops already existed, and was attributed to Dorotheus of Tyre. Because Theophanes does not mention the catalogue of apostles and disciples, it is probable that this work originated after 811, and was added to the list of bishops and then also attributed to Dorotheus of Tyre. Cf. *supra* pp. 178–180.

⁵⁷ Cf. Krumbacher, *op. cit.*, p. 396.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

bishops of Constantinople which, again, starts with the name of Metrophanes.⁵⁸ Once more we find here the influence of the tradition established by the authority of Socrates, the original tradition, which knew little or nothing of the religious situation in Byzantium before Constantine the Great.

Apparently these misgivings led some serious-minded men to look elsewhere for a strengthening of the claim of apostolicity by the Byzantine patriarchal see, and they found the evidence they needed in the fact that Constantinople, which had obtained supreme jurisdiction over the former Roman diocese of Pontus, had become the heir of Ephesus, a see which, having been founded by St. John the Apostle, was of apostolic origin. Constantinople could, therefore, claim St. John's apostolic authority. The Syriac *Doctrina apostolorum*⁵⁹ suggested that there may have existed another tradition extending John's activity and jurisdiction to the other side of the Bosphorus, over Macedonia and Achaea.

There is, at least, one piece of evidence which seems to justify this interpretation. When the Patriarch Ignatius was judged by the legates of the Roman see in the Synod of 861, he invoked the apostolicity of his see in their presence. The interesting dialogue from the extracts of the Synod, preserved in Deusdedit's canonical collection, deserves quotation verbatim.⁶⁰ The incident occurred during the first session of the Synod: "Ignatius said to the legates: 'Before you have started your interrogation, you have already

⁵⁸ For a while this work was wrongly attributed to Eusebius. It was first published by A. Mai, *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio*, 1, pt. 2 (Rome, 1825), pp. 1-39, republished by A. Schoene, *Eusebii chronicorum libri duo*, 1 (Berlin, 1875), appendix, pp. 63-102 (the passage on p. 79). Cf. also H. Gelzer, *Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie* (Leipzig, 1880), pp. 329 seq. The same tradition was followed by some authors of similar lists of bishops of Constantinople. Cf. Th. Schermann, *op. cit.*, pp. 191 seq. Such a catalogue (*Vindobonensis historicus graecus* 76, f. 136^v) is mentioned by M. F. Fischer (*De patriarcharum Constantinopolitanorum Catalogis et de chronologia primorum patriarcharum, Commentarii philologici Jenenses*, 3 [Leipzig, 1894], p. 270) and goes back to 956. Another which extends from Metrophanes to Cyprian (1706) was republished by S. A. Morcelli, *Kalendarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, II (Rome, 1788), p. 232.

⁵⁹ See W. Cureton, *Ancient Syriac Documents* (London, 1864), p. 34. The evangelization of Thrace is attributed to Luke.

⁶⁰ V. Wolf von Glanvell, *Die Kanonensammlung des Kardinals Deusdedit* (Paderborn, 1905), p. 603.

GROWTH OF THE ANDREW LEGEND

prejudged me.' The Legates said: 'In what way?' Ignatius said: 'Because you, although you are [only] bishops, are sitting, and I am standing although I am a Patriarch.' The legates said: 'This happens because you are committed to judgment and because we, although we are [only] bishops, represent the apostolic see.' Ignatius said: 'I am also in possession of the throne of the Apostle John and of Andrew who was the first to be called Apostle.'"

This passage has remained unnoticed until recently. Because the Acts of the Synod give the lie in many ways to the tradition about the dispute between Ignatius and Photius that has prevailed among historians, no-one has dared to take the statements contained in the Acts at their face value.⁶¹ But in even this detail the Acts satisfactorily complete our knowledge of the thinking that prevailed in Constantinople in Ignatius' time.

Ignatius' claim that the apostolic character of Constantinople's episcopal see goes back to St. John is, strangely enough, echoed in a document ascribed to his adversary, the Patriarch Photius. This is the letter to Zachary, Catholicos of Armenia, wherein there appears a very strange passage, concerning the foundation of the four main patriarchal sees, in which the apostolicity of Constantinople is said to derive from John the Evangelist.⁶²

The whole passage is of great interest, and it will be worth-while to give here a translation of at least that part which is most relevant. Following the explanation of how God chose the Greeks to cultivate science and to construct a philosophical system, both of which were helpful in the propagation of the Christian doctrine after its rejection by the Jews, the author of the letter goes on:

"When Our Lord had finished preaching the good tidings to the fathers, and had ascended to His Father, He entrusted the prophetic tradition to the Holy Apostles enjoining them to spread it over

⁶¹ For evidence of their authenticity and reliability see F. Dvornik, *op. cit.*, pp. 70 seq.

⁶² Ed. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, "Fotija, archiepiskopa Konstantinopol'skago, o grobe Gospoda našego Iisusa Christa i drugija malyja ego tvorenija," in *Pravoslavnyj Palestinskij Sbornik*, 31 (St. Petersburg, 1892), pp. 179-195; Russian translation by N. Marr, *ibid.*, pp. 227-245. Mai's first edition is reprinted in *PG*, 102, cols. 703-714, but the passage in question (Armenian text, *ibid.*, pp. 185 seq.; Russian translation, *ibid.*, pp. 233 seq.) is omitted in Mai's edition. It is quoted here in the translation from the Armenian, for which I am indebted to my colleague Professor Sirarpie Der Nersessian.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

the Greek countries and, through them, to all pagan countries as it is written: 'The Mountain of Sion on the northern side, the city of the Great King' [Ps. 47:3, 48:2]. This, after Jerusalem was truly realized in Constantinople, which is the second Jerusalem, built by the second David, that is Saint Constantine. And there is fulfilled what is said: 'God is in their midst, and they will not waver' [Ps. 45:6, 46:5], because, after that, in the imperial city the same Constantine was portrayed in stone with the sign of the Holy Cross. And then the same Holy Immeasurable Divinity, which rests on the four beasts as Ezekiel saw them, which created the world with four seasons and brought out from Paradise the four rivers to water the Universe, deigned to establish with the four evangelists four patriarchal sees, by which the Apostolic and Catholic Church is governed, that they may truly and constantly propagate the ineffable economy of Our Lord, Jesus Christ. And these are the sees: Matthew in Antioch, Mark in Alexandria, Luke in Rome, and John in Constantinople, which is the New Rome; but they call also the bishop of Jerusalem a patriarch, because of the holy places. And so these five patriarchates used from the beginning the Greek language. Paul, after having chosen the country of the Greeks, journeyed there and composed in their cities fourteen of his epistles, addressed to them. Luke wrote the Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles in Greek. He too, writes in his Acts of the Apostles about Greece. The great Peter wrote epistles to the country of Pontus, whose inhabitants were Greeks. In the same way, James, John, and Judas wrote to the Greeks, and in Antioch, where the first Church was founded there lived Greeks, because it is said 'When they came to Antioch, they talked to the Greeks,' [Acts, 11:20]. And in the same Acts what is said about the widows [6:1] indicates clearly that there were Greeks in Jerusalem. The same can be said about John who lived a long time here [in Greece], observed the spread of the Gospel, and then organized everything correctly; for this purpose too, he wrote the Gospel and other works, as Saint Ephrem says that the New Testament was written by him for the Greeks."⁶³

⁶³ The passage on the four patriarchates and four evangelists did not escape the attention of Cardinal Mai who irately comments on the Stachys

GROWTH OF THE ANDREW LEGEND

The author of the letter says further that the apostles, inspired by the Holy Ghost, abandoned Hebrew letters when God had rejected Israel because of its refusal to accept Christ, and ordered them to write in Greek. Even the Old Testament was translated into Greek under Ptolemy Philadelphus. The successors to the apostles, the Holy Fathers who continued their teaching, were Greeks. Then the letter goes on:

"The Lord gave the Greeks also the *imperium*, the priesthood and the prophetic order, that is the choir of holy monks and priests, as well as the five patriarchs and bishops ordained by them for the entire world, through whom the Catholic Church is governed. And, as the Israelites possessed the *imperium* until the advent of Christ, so we believe that the *imperium* will not be taken from the Greeks before the second advent of Our Lord Jesus Christ Who Himself is priest, king, prophet, and God of all. Then He will present to the Almighty Father those who have been reborn through baptism. He will abolish all power and government, and then the evil which is now in us having come to an end, we shall be in the obedience of the Father."

There is no doubt that Photius corresponded with Zachary, the Catholicos of Armenia and that he addressed a letter also to Ashod, the ruler of that country.⁶⁴ The authenticity of the letter to Zachary as it is preserved, is, however, doubtful, although J. Laurent⁶⁵ and V. Grumel⁶⁶ regard it as genuine. Recently, G. Garitte⁶⁷ has con-

story and on this passage of Photius' letter (*Patrum nova Bibliotheca* 4 [Rome, 1847], p. 49): *At recentior chronographus, quem nos edidimus, Ephraemius [cf. supra p. 238, footnote 58] cum neotericis aliis, facit initium sui catalogi a Stachy, apostolicorum temporum homine, fraude notissima schismaticorum, ut apostolicam dignitatem byzantinae sedi vindicent. Quid ipse Photius? Nonne in sua ad Armenios epistola insignem vel fraudem fecit, vel ab interpolatoribus passus est, dum pro Petro Lucam romanae cathedrae fundatorem scripsit, Antiochensis autem Matthaeum? Passus inquam fortasse ab orientalibus interpolatoribus magis fraudem videtur Photius, quam dolo proprio tam absurde egisse.... Etenim...idem in alia epistola...romani pontificis apostolicum primatum agnoscebat ac fatebatur.*

⁶⁴ J. Hergenröther, *Photius, Patriarch von Konstantinopel*, 1, pp. 481-494.

⁶⁵ *L'Arménie entre Byzance et l'Islam depuis la conquête arabe jusqu'en 886* (Paris, 1919), pp. 309-316.

⁶⁶ *Les régestes des actes du patriarchat de Constantinople*, 1, pt. 2 (Istanbul, 1936), no. 473, p. 85.

⁶⁷ "La *Narratio de rebus Armeniae*. Edition critique et commentaire," *Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium* 132, *Subsidia*, t. 4 (Louvain, 1952), pp. 370-375.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

siderably weakened the thesis of its authenticity by showing that the author of the first part of the text used an Armenian work on the acceptance and subsequent rejection of the decision of the Council of Chalcedon by the Armenians. This document contained some errors, concerning the dates of the first councils, that are repeated in this part of the letter. They are copied also in the *Narratio de rebus Armeniae*, a work composed about the year 700 by an orthodox Armenian, who appears to have used the same source as the author of this part of the letter. A Greek patriarch, least of all one of Photius' standing, could hardly have committed such errors.^{67a}

This, however, does not mean that the passage under discussion must also have been interpolated. Because of the Byzantine nationalist sentiments that it so obviously betrays, it could hardly have been written by an Armenian, or copied, like the first part of the letter, from an Armenian document.

In any case, it is important to stress that this is not isolated evidence of the existence of such a tradition, at least in Armenia. A similar account of the establishment of the four patriarchates corresponding to the four evangelists can be found also in the *History of Armenia*, by the Catholicos John VI, who writes as follows:⁶⁸

^{67a} Three letters from the Patriarch Photius to the Armenians are preserved in Ms. 2756 of the National Library of Greece in Athens, and have been made known recently by J. Darrouzès. The first letter, folios 120^v to 169^v, is a treatise against the Theopaschites. The other two folios 169^v to 173^v and folios 173^v to 176^v, are addressed "to the Armenians." Unfortunately none of the three documents seems to be similar to the letter addressed to Zachary known only in its Armenian translation. This new discovery does not, as far as we can see, resolve the question of authenticity of the letter to Zachary as we know it. It does confirm, however, that Photius had sent a letter to Zachary, for such a missive is mentioned in the Ms. on folio 168. This indicates, too, that Photius corresponded with the Armenians more frequently than he was, until now, thought to have done. The author wishes to thank Father J. Darrouzès for making available to him a copy of excerpts from the newly discovered text. It was impossible to obtain a photographic copy of the full text from the Library. A description of the Ms. and its contents, by Father Darrouzès, is to be found in the *Revue des études byzantines*, 12 (1954), pp. 183-186 ("Notes d'épistolographie et d'histoire de textes," pp. 176-188).

⁶⁸ *History by John Catholicos* (Jerusalem, 1867), pp. 61-62, chap. 12 (in Armenian). I am indebted to my colleague Professor S. Der Nersessian for

GROWTH OF THE ANDREW LEGEND

"Constantius, the son of the great Constantine, had transferred from Ephesus to Constantinople the relics of John the Evangelist, and, emboldened by this, established a patriarch in Constantinople. Later the people of Jerusalem, also emboldened by his act, raised their see to patriarchal rank, considering this legitimate since it was there that the Logos of the Father was born, was seen to walk among men, was baptized by John, was crucified, buried, and rose on the third day. And until that time there were only four patriarchs in the world, because of the four Evangelists, Matthew in Antioch, Mark in Alexandria, Luke in Rome, and John in Ephesus, but after these acts there were six in all."

It seems, thus, that the Armenian writer regarded Ephesus also as a patriarchate because the see of that city was founded by John the Evangelist. The tradition that mentions the transfer of John's relics to Constantinople is, of course, incorrect, but the meaning of the passage is clear: Constantinople was regarded as the successor to Ephesus which had been founded by St. John. In the next passage John VI added a seventh patriarchate—Armenia, elevated to that position because that country possessed the relics of the Apostles Bartholomew and Thaddaeus, who, according to Armenian legendary tradition, had evangelized it.

John VI was born between 830 and 835 and died in 925. The first part of his History was written at the end of the ninth century before he became Catholicos.⁶⁹ The passage quoted above reflects, therefore, a tradition which must already have existed, at least in Armenia, in the ninth century. It is therefore almost contemporary with the composition of Photius' letter to Zachary, and it can be surmised that Photius, or his interpolator, used an account of the patriarchs that was familiar to the Armenians. The declaration of Ignatius during the Synod of 861 shows, however, that a similar tradition was known also in Constantinople, at least a tradition connecting that city with St. John.

the translation of this passage. The translation by M. J. Saint-Martin (*Histoire d'Arménie par le patriarche Jean VI* [Paris, 1841], p. 39) is inexact on this particular point. Cf. also A. Pichler, *Geschichte der kirchlichen Trennung*, 2 (Munich, 1865), p. 435.

⁶⁹ Cf. F. Lajard's note on John VI in Saint-Martin's translation, *op. cit.*, pp. viii-xii.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

On the other hand, the analogy with the evangelists helps us to understand why, in this account, the patriarchate of Rome is linked not with Peter, but with Luke. It was easy to associate Alexandria and Ephesus with Mark and John Matthew does not fit in very well with Antioch, but it was possible to suggest that he wrote his Gospel there before going to his missionary territory. With regard to Rome, only Luke, secretary to St. Paul, could be imagined as working there with Peter and Paul.

This tradition must have continued outside Byzantium, especially in the East, in later periods. It is reflected in the apocryphal canons of the Council of Nicaea, which were used by the Nestorian and Monophysite Christians and are preserved in an Arabic version. Here the principle of four patriarchs and four evangelists is strengthened by other similarities stressing the holiness of the member four in the divine economy. The primacy of Peter in Rome is, however, expressed very clearly, and the linking of the four patriarchates with the evangelists is conceived more logically. The transfer of the patriarchate of Ephesus to Constantinople is also duly recalled.⁷⁰

It is reasonable to conclude from the above that some Byzantine ecclesiastical circles derived the apostolicity of their see from St. John, whose heirs the patriarchs of Constantinople thus became. The basis of this claim lay in the transfer of jurisdiction over Asia Minor from the bishops of Ephesus to those of Constantinople, which also explains why the Andrew and Stachys Legend emerged so late, and why Byzantine official circles were not too anxious to develop or promote it.

⁷⁰ Mansi, 2 col. 992, canon 37: *Et sint patriarchae in universo mundo quatuor tantum, quemadmodum sunt scriptores evangelii quatuor et flumina quatuor, et elementa mundi quatuor, et anguli quatuor, et venti quatuor, et compositio hominis quatuor, quoniam hisce quatuor universus constituitur orbis. Et sit princeps ac praepositus ipsis dominus sedis divi Petri Romae, sicut praeceperunt apostoli. Post illum vero dominus magnae Alexandriae, et est sedes Marci. Tertius vero dominus Ephesi, et est sedes Johannis Theologi divina eloquentis. Quartus tandem dominus Antiochiae, et est sedes Petri quoque. Et dividantur omnes episcopi sub manibus horum quatuor patriarcharum.* Col. 993, canon 38: *Transferatur patriarchatus Ephesi ad urbem regiam, ut honor sit regno et sacerdotio simul.* A similar tradition concerning the transfer of Ephesus' apostolic prerogatives to Constantinople must have existed also in Alexandria, as is attested by John Philoponus. See the quotation *supra*, pp. 135, 136.

GROWTH OF THE ANDREW LEGEND

All of this contradicts the generally accepted opinion that the Andrew Legend was, if not invented, at least propagated by the Patriarch Photius.⁷¹ It has been clearly shown above that Photius did not invent the Andrew Legend in order to endow his see with an apostolic character. Like his predecessor, Ignatius, he also quite probably attributed the apostolicity of his see to the fact that Constantinople had become the heir to the see of Ephesus, founded by the Apostle John. When it is considered that—as attested by Ignatius—the Andrew and Stachys story had, at this time, found credence too in the official circles of the *patriarcheion*, it would not have been surprising had even Photius accepted it.

On the other hand, the learned Patriarch must have seen that this new tradition was not well founded in historical sources. A perusal of his writings will, strangely enough, fail to disclose any evidence that he too had followed this new trend in Byzantine ecclesiastical tradition.

Photius seems to have studied thoroughly the early history of Constantinople and of his see, and this study must have evoked some doubts in his mind about the reliability of the Andrew and Stachys tradition. His *Bibliotheca* contains extracts from two works dealing with the early history of Constantinople and mentioning Bishop Metrophanes and his successor Alexander. The first⁷² extract comes from the Church History written by Gelasius, Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine, and recounts what the author said concerning the Council of Nicaea. Metrophanes is reported to have sent the priest Alexander as his representative to the Council. He was unable to go himself because of his age, for in 325 he was more than one hundred years old.

The other extract is even more important. It is from a lost work entitled "*Politeia* of the Holy Fathers, Metrophanes, and Alexander, containing also the Life of Constantine the Great Emperor."⁷³ It reproduces a legendary tradition concerning Constantine who,

⁷¹ This opinion was voiced fairly recently by F. Dölger in his paper "Rom in der Gedankenwelt der Byzantiner," in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 56 (1937), pp. 40–42, reprinted, with this passage unchanged, in 1953 in *Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt*, pp. 112 seq.

⁷² *Bibliotheca*, cod. 88, PG, 103, cols. 289 seq.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, cod. 256, PG, 104, cols. 105–120.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

according to the anonymous author, had already been initiated into the Christian faith by his father. It must have given a detailed account of Metrophanes' and Alexander's activities, although it apparently made no reference to the legend about Metrophanes' predecessors.

From these two, as well as from other writings, Photius must have made critical appraisals of the Andrew tradition of which he became increasingly sceptical and condemnatory as he studied some of the apocryphal literature that tried to enlarge on the meager details known about the history of the twelve apostles. Among the apocryphal Acts of the Apostles which he read were the Acts or Travels of Andrew, as he himself testifies.⁷⁴ Of course no reference to Andrew's activity in Byzantium was made in the apocryphal Acts, although they did mention his stay there.

Photius also read the *encomium* pronounced by the fifth-century writer Hesychius of Jerusalem in honor of St. Thomas.⁷⁵ In this panegyric Hesychius greatly praised the Apostle Andrew, and Photius reproduced this in his *Bibliotheca*. As has been clearly shown, Hesychius—if, indeed, he was actually the author of the *encomium*—⁷⁶ could not have known the Andrew and Stachys Legend, which originated much later, and this could only have increased Photius' scepticism.

It is true that this solitary quotation in praise of Andrew, taken from that part of Hesychius' writing which is found in Photius' works, begins with words that evoke some doubt: "Andrew, the first-born of the company of the apostles, the first pillar of the Church, Peter before Peter, the basis of the basis, the beginning of the beginning, who called before being called, who brought before being brought. . . ." These seem daring statements, but even in these words the panegyrist makes it clear that the real basis and beginning was actually Peter. This is indicated again at the end of the passage, quoted by Photius, in praise of Peter: "You will be called

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, cod. 114, PG, 103, col. 389. Cf. *supra* p. 190. Photius also voices his scepticism regarding the apocryphal Acts of Andrew when discussing the work of the heretic Agapius, *ibid.*, cod. 179 (PG, 103, col. 525).

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, cod. 269, PG, 104, cols. 197 seq. Apparently the *encomium* was written in honor of St. Andrew, not of Thomas as the manuscript says.

⁷⁶ F. Dölger (*op. cit.*, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengesch.* p. 41. *Europ. Staatenwelt*, p. 114, footnote 73) hesitates to attribute this *encomium* to Hesychius.

GROWTH OF THE ANDREW LEGEND

Cephas. You received remuneration before confession, before you worked in the vineyard you obtained the denarius, before you touched the altar your offering was accepted, before you have preached you were crowned." This is, of course, a different theme, and one cannot interpret this passage as proof that Photius wished to replace Peter by Andrew.⁷⁷

And now, what about the pamphlet entitled, "Against those who say that Rome is the first See"?⁷⁸ It is known that in two late manuscripts this treatise follows Photius' work *Συναγωγή*, and that the Andrew-Stachys Legend is quoted by the author of this treatise among his arguments against the Roman primacy. This treatise is attributed by many scholars to Photius.

From all that has been set forth above, however, it can be seen how very unlikely, indeed impossible, it is that Photius could have been the author of such a pamphlet, or that such a treatise could have been composed in the ninth century. A simple survey of the main arguments used by the compiler of the pamphlet will show that it could have been written only at a much later period.

The principle of apostolic foundation is stretched in the pamphlet to a point entirely incompatible with Byzantine thinking of the ninth century. In this treatise Antioch takes precedence over Rome because Peter was its Bishop eight years before he went to Rome. Then comes Jerusalem, because James, the Lord's "brother," was its Bishop and the first of the apostles to suffer a martyr's death, because Peter had worked there, and because Jerusalem was the city in which the Lord had resided. Constantinople, however, is

⁷⁷ F. Dölger, *op. cit.*, *Europ. Staatenwelt*, p. 114, quoted only the first part of the passage: "Wenn also Rom seinen Petrus ins Feld führte dann: Schach dem Petrus. Ein noch älterer Apostel als er, ὁ πρὸ Πέτρου Πέτρος hatte den apostolischen Stuhl von Konstantinopel gegründet." He attributes also to Hergenröther (*Photius*, I, p. 659), "weitere Argumente dafür, daß Photios die Andreaslegende im Kampfe um die kirchliche Vorrangstellung Konstantinopels verwendete." Hergenröther, however, gives no other arguments than the spurious writing against the Roman primacy attributed to the Patriarch. The rest are merely unfounded suppositions. It should be noted that Hesychius even calls James, the Lord's "brother," "head of the apostles" (*Photius, ibid.*, cod. 275, PG, 104, col. 241), and that the Ignatianist Nicetas (see *supra*, p. 210) called Andrew "Peter after Peter."

⁷⁸ See the latest edition by M. Gordillo, *Photius et primatus Romanus*, in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 6 (1940), pp. 5 seq. Latin interpretation in M. Jugie, *Theologia dogmatica christianorum orientalium* 1, (Paris, 1926), pp. 131 seq.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

said, in the pamphlet, to have a better right to the primacy than Rome because its see was founded by Andrew, the first man called by Christ to become His apostle; also, it was founded before the Roman see.

The "Petrine principle" that the three sees, founded by Peter—Antioch, Alexandria, and Rome—were entitled to prominent rank in Church organization, was used almost exclusively by Rome in defence of its primacy. Actually, only a few timid attempts were made by the Easterners to refute Rome's claims by pointing out the apostolic character of Antioch and Alexandria and by emphasizing that the Christians had obtained their name in Antioch, but these attempts were never made with the vehemence and outspokenness revealed in this pamphlet. The reticence of the Easterners has been shown to have been due to the principle of adaptation to the political division of the Empire. This principle was uppermost in their minds, especially in the minds of the Byzantines. As long as there was hope for, and a possibility of, maintaining the idea of one Roman Empire, the Byzantines were ready to respect the prominent position of Rome—the first capital of the Empire and the foundation on which its greatness had been built. In spite of the "revolution" against the lawful Roman Emperor, "plotted" by Pope Leo III and Charlemagne, this hope was still alive in the ninth century. The offer made in 867 by Michael III to Louis II to recognize the latter's imperial title was the most recent evidence of the conviction in Byzantium that the ideal unity of the Roman Empire still existed, and could yet be expressed publicly by political agreement between the Roman Emperor residing in Constantinople and the Co-Emperor of the West.^{78a}

This consideration makes it very unlikely that a pamphlet degrading Rome to as low a position in Church organization as this one did could have been written before the year 867, i.e. the period of the dispute between Constantinople and Rome under Nicholas I. Had Photius himself used such arguments in his polemic with the Pope, one would certainly expect to find some traces of them in his or the Pope's correspondence.

In this respect there is no indication that the Patriarch or his

^{78a} See F. Dvornik, *op. cit.*, p. 121.

GROWTH OF THE ANDREW LEGEND

followers adduced any kind of primacy for Constantinople from the fact—so strongly stressed in the pamphlet—that Andrew had founded the see of Constantinople before his brother Peter came to Rome. It is, in fact, rather surprising that Photius nowhere claimed an apostolic character for his see. If he had made any such claim between 856 and 867, Pope Nicholas I might have been expected to have reacted strongly, at least on the two occasions when he was defending the primacy and apostolic character of his own see.

In his first defense, undertaken to protect the privileges of his see and contained in his answer to Michael III's letter received by Nicholas toward the end of the summer of 865, the Pope pointed out⁷⁹ that only Rome could boast of having seen, living and dying within its walls, both St. Peter and St. Paul, the founders of its glory. After Rome, Alexandria and Antioch could claim to have been in closest relation with the two Apostles. Constantinople, however, had to "plunder other Churches of their patron saints in order to enrich itself with spoils taken by violence from others." This is an echo of the old Petrine argument, but the relics of St. Andrew are not singled out, an indication that Nicholas knew nothing of the new Andrew tradition.

In his second defense, a letter to Boris of Bulgaria, the Pope, denying the apostolic character to the see of Constantinople, was even more outspoken, but again without mentioning Andrew:⁸⁰ "Only those should be regarded as true patriarchs who occupy apostolic sees in [continuous] succession of pontiffs. . . . Such is the case of the sees of Rome, of Alexandria, and of Antioch. . . . The bishops of Constantinople and of Jerusalem, although they are called patriarchs, are not of such importance as those mentioned above. Concerning the see of Constantinople, it has neither been founded by any of the apostles. . . nor was it mentioned by the Council of Nicaea. This bishop was called patriarch because Constantinople was said to be the New Rome, more by the favor of secular princes than for any other reason."

Nicholas I refers to the Apostle Andrew only twice in his letters. In both instances he manifests a deep respect for this Apostle. In

⁷⁹ *MGH, Epist.* 6, p. 475.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 592 seq., especially chap. 92, pp. 596 seq.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

his letter of 866 to Boris⁸¹ the Pope directs that fasting on Friday be omitted when the feast of "Our Lady, or of the principal Apostles, Peter and Paul, or of St. John the Baptist, or of the blessed John the Evangelist, or of the brother of the heavenly keybearer, that is, the Apostle Andrew" falls on that day.

Another mention of Andrew is found in Nicholas' letter to Adalvin, Archbishop of Salzburg, written in 864.⁸² There also the Pope mentions Andrew in addition to the Apostles James and John: "Woe to the bishops who have to choose for their imitation Peter, Andrew, James, and John to whom the Lord said: 'Follow me and I shall make you fishers of men,' whose disciples they also are, but who imitate rather Nimrod and Ishmael and Esau." This respect for the Apostle Andrew, expressed on both occasions, seems to indicate that the Pope knew nothing of the Andrew story concerning the apostolicity of Constantinople, and that, at least until 866, this tradition was not put forward by the Byzantines in official documents as a means of strengthening their position vis-à-vis Roman claims.

It might be assumed that arguments stressing Constantinople's apostolicity and primacy due to its having been founded by Andrew, the first-called by the Lord, before Peter had established himself in Rome, were circulated in Bulgaria in 866 by Greek missionaries, competing unsuccessfully with Roman priests who had won the favor of the Khagan Boris. Such an argument would have impressed this primitive, but intelligent, convert whose allegiance was coveted by the two Christian centers.

The Roman priests reported to Nicholas on the activity of their Byzantine rivals. On the basis of their reports the Pope decided to alert the whole West to the defense of Rome and its primacy, and his fears and misgivings over this Greek propaganda are clearly reflected in his letter to Hincmar of Rheims.⁸³ All of which shows that the Greeks in Bulgaria were in fact emphasizing the pre-eminence of Constantinople in the Church, but their principal argument was that the primacy had passed from Rome to Con-

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 571 (chap. 5).

⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 632.

⁸³ See for details F. Dvornik, *op. cit.*, pp. 123 seq.

GROWTH OF THE ANDREW LEGEND

stantinople because the latter had become the first city of the Empire and the residence of the emperors.

Nicholas says, in this same letter, that he had studied not only the official letters, but also "other writings"⁸⁴ brought by his legates from Bulgaria. It is, therefore, permissible to suppose that the Greeks had defended their position in Bulgaria in writings which were then handed over to the papal legates by Boris, together with a letter he had received from Constantinople. If this is so, it must be concluded from Nicholas' reaction, revealed in his letter to Hincmar, that these writings contained nothing on the apostolicity of the Constantinopolitan see, or, in particular, on its foundation by Andrew, Peter's brother. The old principle of accommodation to the political and administrative division of the Empire was still, in 866, used by the Greeks as their main argument in their struggle for Bulgaria.

A passage from Ratramus, who, following the exhortation of Nicholas, wrote a long reply to Greek calumnies against Rome, confirms this conclusion. The learned Abbot of Corbie attributes the exaltation of the patriarchate of Constantinople not to the patriarchs themselves, but to the emperors, whom he accuses of thereby claiming for themselves "the sublime position of the apostles... assuming for themselves a principate which neither Christ, nor the apostles, nor the doctors of the Church, nor any custom had given to them."⁸⁵ Here again no allusion to the Andrew Legend is

⁸⁴ MGH, *Epist.* 6, p. 603. In the same document Nicholas enumerates further accusations against the Latin Church, which he had found in the writings brought from Bulgaria—the offering of a lamb at the Easter Mass, the shaving off of beards by priests, the ordaining of deacons as bishops—but there was nothing to suggest that the Greeks had placed the Andrew Legend in the forefront of their fight over Bulgaria.

⁸⁵ Ratramnus Corbeiensis, *Contra Graecorum opposita*, PL, 121, col. 335A,B (bk. 4, chap. 8). *Ambiant sibi vindicare principatum, quem nec Christus eis, nec apostoli, nec Ecclesiarum magistri, nec ulla consuetudo contribuit... Quid enim isti Graecorum principes aliud altitudine cordis sui dicunt, qui Ecclesiae sibi principatum usurpant, et apostolorum sublimitatem... sibi vindicant, cupientes solium suae dignitatis super astra coeli componere, id est omni sanctorum coetui praeferre, et patriarcharum venerationem usurpare; quatenus omni Ecclesia sibi subjecta Christo similes efficiantur: cum nulla majorum auctoritas hoc eis contribuat, nec ecclesiastica jura concedant, verum nec humanae leges ascribant? Quae cuncta sibi vindicare velle potissimum comprobant, quod patriarcham Constantinopolitanum praeponere Romano pontifici gestiunt, et urbem Constantinopolim Romae praeferre conantur, tanquam sui juris existat leges ecclesiasticas immutare, et regnorum apicem disponere.* This

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

found in Ratramus' polemics against the Greeks. According to him it was not the patriarchs, but the emperors of Constantinople who were claiming apostolic succession and power.

Aeneas, Bishop of Paris, also composed a treatise against Greek accusations, and this likewise faithfully reflects what Nicholas had learned from his legates about Greek attacks in Bulgaria against Roman primacy and customs. His apology shows clearly that the theory of the transfer of the primacy from Rome to Constantinople was actually used by Greek missionaries in Bulgaria.⁸⁶ Aeneas skillfully employs the Petrine principle,⁸⁷ quotes the so-called *Decretum Gelasianum* and the *Donatio Constantini*,⁸⁸ and, when pointing out that the canons of the Council of Sardica decreed the see of Rome to be the highest court of appeal from the decisions of bishops, he stresses the fact that Ignatius had made use of this right of appeal.⁸⁹ There is nothing in Aeneas' treatise to suggest that the Byzantines were appealing to the apostolic character of their see, and nothing to indicate that the Andrew Legend had been used in the Greek arguments against Rome.

Another opportunity for Photius to use the Andrew tradition for this purpose was provided by the Council that met in 867 in Constantinople to defend Byzantium's rights and to condemn the behavior of Pope Nicholas. Pope Hadrian II read the Acts of this Synod, which are not preserved, but his statements about this

passage is a very interesting criticism of the main principles of Byzantine political philosophy, and illustrates how far the Latin West had drifted from the political ideas which had been professed by St. Leo the Great and even by St. Gregory the Great. F. Dölger (*op. cit.*, *Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch.*, 56 [1937], p. 32, *Europ. Staatenwelt*, p. 103) uses this passage as the main argument for his thesis "daß Photios in der Tat den Primat der Gesamtkirche auf Konstantinopel übertragen wollte." This is a strange misinterpretation, which he repeats even more emphatically in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 40 (1940), p. 524.

⁸⁶ *Liber adversus Graecos*, PL, 121, *praeformatio*, col. 689C: *Conqueruntur etiam de transmigratione principatus Romanae sedis, quam dicunt factam Constantinopoli, unde et eam cum patriarcha suo caput dignitatis appellant.*

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, chap. 1, col. 689D. When quoting the decision of the Council of Constantinople (381), he did not omit the words giving to the bishop of Constantinople second place after the bishop of Rome (*ibid.*, chap. 192, col. 750).

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, chap. 187, col. 748, chap. 209, col. 758.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, chaps. 193, 194, cols. 750 seq., cf. also chap. 209, col. 759.

GROWTH OF THE ANDREW LEGEND

Council⁹⁰ also show that the Andrew Legend was not employed by the Byzantines against Rome's claims.

This eliminates the two main occasions on which Photius might have been expected to use the Andrew Legend as a weapon against Rome. It is scarcely imaginable that he would have dared to write such an attack on Rome's primacy during his exile, for that would hardly have been helpful toward winning the favor of Basil I who was enjoying good relations with Rome, and after Photius' reconciliation with Rome such an attack would have been unthinkable. It is thus illogical to designate Photius as the author of a treatise that makes such conspicuous use of the Andrew tradition against Rome.

There are, in this opusculum, many other statements and assertions which are obviously at odds with the situation in Byzantium and with Byzantine thinking in Photius' time. They have been investigated and analyzed by the last editor⁹¹ of the opusculum and, in spite of recent criticism,⁹² his deductions remain unshaken. The ideas expressed by the anonymous author of the treatise presuppose a much more advanced period in the relationship between Constantinople and Rome, which could have been the end of the twelfth and the beginning of the thirteenth century, but certainly not earlier.⁹³

⁹⁰ See Mansi, 16, col. 123. For details see F. Dvornik, *op. cit.*, pp. 129 seq., 141 seq. Cf. also F. Dvornik, "The Patriarch Photius and Iconoclasm," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 7 (Cambridge, Mass., 1953), pp. 93 seq., on Photius' homily pronounced at the closing of the Council of 867.

⁹¹ M. Gordillo, *op. cit.*, pp. 29-39. The passionate manner in which the anonymous polemist repudiates the canons of the synod of Sardica clashes in particular with the conduct of Photius and his followers. Photius' most prominent supporters—the Bishops Asbestos and Zachary—appealed to Rome from the judgment of their Patriarch and this right of appeal was virtually recognized by the Photian Synod of 861. See for details, F. Dvornik, *The Photian Schism*, pp. 24-32, 70-89.

⁹² F. Dölger in *BZ*, 40 (1940), pp. 522-525.

⁹³ From the twelfth century onward—not before (cf. F. Dvornik, *op. cit.*, pp. 383-406). Mainly because of his *Mystagogia* wherein the polemist found their arguments against Filioge, Photius became the patron saint, so to speak, and a master of anti-Latin polemist. This explains some similarities in expression between this treatise and Photius' works, but in spite of some new parallels found by Dölger, these similarities are few and inconclusive. The popularity that Photius began to enjoy among anti-Latin polemist, explains, too, why in some manuscripts this pamphlet follows the treatise *Συναγωγή* which is attributed to Photius.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

These considerations, although not actually conclusive evidence, indicate clearly the attitude of Byzantine official circles toward the new tradition regarding the origin of the see of Byzantium. Further substantiation of the reserve with which official ecclesiastical circles in Byzantium regarded the spread of this tradition is to be found in the *Typicon* of Constantinople which was used in Hagia Sophia during the ninth century, and is preserved in Manuscript 266 of Patmos.

The feast of St. Andrew was celebrated in the Byzantine Church on November 30th. No conclusion indicating that this Apostle was regarded as the founder of the see of Byzantium can be deduced from the way in which the *Typicon*⁹⁴ introduces his feast. Andrew's brother Peter is, however, duly called "coryphaeus of all apostles." It is, furthermore, surprising to see that the memory of Stachys, which the synaxaries of the tenth century and of later periods celebrated on October 30th, is not mentioned in the *Typicon*. For this day the *Typicon* mentions only the names of the following saints: Zenobius, Zenobia, Marcianus, Claudius, Asterius, Neon, Neonilla, Lysius, Coriacus, and Eutropia.⁹⁵ All of these names are marked in the synaxaries of the tenth century, which add to them the names of Julianus, Kronion, Macarius, and Alexander. All of the names are, however, preceded in these later synaxaries by the commemoration of Christ's disciples, three of whom—Stachys, Amplias, and Urbanus—are mentioned in particular.⁹⁶ Stachys is, of course, said to have been ordained Bishop of Byzantium by Andrew, to have taught the Christians at Argyropolis for sixteen years, and to have died there in peace.

⁹⁴ Dmitrijevskij, *Opisanie*, 1, p. 27: "Αθλησις τοῦ ἁγίου καὶ πανευφήμου καὶ πρωτοκλήτου ἀποστόλου Ἀνδρέου, ἀδελφοῦ Πέτρου τοῦ Κορυφαίου τῶν ἀποστόλων. Εἰς τὴν εἰσοδὸν λέγομεν τροπάριον ἥχος γ'. Τῆς νοητῆς θαλάσσης τοὺς ἀνθρωποβόρους ἰχθύας ἐσαγήνευσας ἀνδρὶα καὶ συνέσει ἐπιβάς τῇ ταραχῇ τῶν κυμάτων καὶ τούτους ἐκβάθους εἰ δωλικοῦ ἀναγαγὼν, προσήγαγες τῷ Δεσπότῃ τῶν δλων, αὐτὸν ἱκέτευε, ἀπόστολε, σωθῆναι τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν. On the celebration of the feast of St. Andrew in Byzantium see the recent study by Ch. Konstantinidis, "La fête de l'apôtre saint André dans l'Eglise de Constantinople à l'époque byzantine et aux temps modernes," *Mélanges en l'honneur de Mgr. M. Andrieu, Revue des sciences religieuses*, volume hors série (Strassburg, 1956), pp. 243-261. According to the author the celebration of the feast of St. Andrew did not, surprisingly enough, occupy a prominent place in the Byzantine liturgy.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

⁹⁶ Delehay, *Synaxarium*, cols. 177 seq.

GROWTH OF THE ANDREW LEGEND

It is evident from this comparison of the *Typicon* with the synaxaries, that the commemoration of Stachys was not introduced into the *Typicon* of Constantinople until the tenth century.⁹⁷ This is especially significant inasmuch as the *Typicon* was almost certainly revised during the second patriarchate of Photius,⁹⁸ who seems also to have been responsible for adding to it the commemoration of the Seventh Oecumenical Council⁹⁹ and the feast of St. Ignatius,¹⁰⁰ his predecessor.

The doubts voiced by H. Delehaye¹⁰¹ as to the origin and character of the *Typicon* were dissipated by A. Baumstark,¹⁰² who showed that this document represents a combination of a *Synaxarion* with a *Typicon* of the Church of Constantinople, and that it achieved its final form only toward the end of the ninth century, most probably during the second patriarchate of Photius.

One detail deserves special attention. It should be noted that, in the same document,¹⁰³ the commemoration of St. Metrophanes (June 4th), who was Bishop of Byzantium under Constantine the Great, is introduced and commented on much as it is in Pseudo-

⁹⁷ It should also be noted that the *Typicon* (Dmitrijevskij, *op. cit.*, p. 84) commemorates on June 30th only the twelve apostles, although, from the tenth century onward, the synaxaries add to the list of apostles that of the seventy disciples including Stachys. See *infra* p. 258.

⁹⁸ On the dating of the *Typicon* see N. Th. Krasnosel'cev, "Tipik cerkvi sv. Sofii v Konstantinopole IX v.," in *Letopis istoriko-filolog.*, 1 (Odessa, 1892), pp. 156-254, especially p. 165.

⁹⁹ This, however, could have been introduced earlier into the liturgical calendar. It was commemorated on October 11th (Dmitrijevskij, *op. cit.*, p. 13). There is no trace in this *Typicon* of the "Feast of Orthodoxy" which was celebrated on the first Sunday of Lent. This feast, commemorating the victory of orthodoxy over iconoclasm, seems not to have been introduced until the tenth century. For details see Krasnosel'cev, *ibid.*, pp. 221 seq., and the study by the same author ("K izučeniju 'Tipika Velikoj Cerkvi'") published in the same collection, 3 (1896), pp. 329-344.

¹⁰⁰ October 22, Dmitrijevskij, *op. cit.*, p. 15: τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰγνατίου, ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως. In the light of the new evidence concerning the relations between Photius and Ignatius before the latter's death, the canonization of Ignatius by Photius seems probable (cf. Dvornik, *op. cit.*, pp. 167-173), and is confirmed by the new version of the *Synodicon Vetus* contained in *Sinaticus Graecus* 482 (1117), fol. 364^v where it is said that Photius put "the name of the blessed Ignatius into the diptychs among all the Saints" and announced it officially from the ambo.

¹⁰¹ *Synaxarium*, cols. 10 seq, 53 seq.

¹⁰² "Das Typikon der Patmos-Handschrift 266," in *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft*, 6 (1926), pp. 98-111.

¹⁰³ Dmitrijevskij, *op. cit.*, pp. 77 seq.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

Dorotheus' catalogue,¹⁰⁴ and in the synaxaries of later periods.¹⁰⁵ Metrophanes is said to have been the son of Dometius, the brother of the Emperor Probus, and Dometius is said to have become Bishop of Byzantium after Titus, and to have been succeeded in the episcopacy by his sons, Probus and Metrophanes.

This would indicate that Pseudo-Dorotheus' catalogue of Byzantine bishops was known to the compiler of this *Typicon*. If this is so, the fact that Stachys is not commemorated in a ninth-century Constantinopolitan *Synaxarion* and *Typicon* is of even greater significance.

It is, however, surprising not to find in the *Typicon*¹⁰⁶ under August 26, any description such as is found in later *Synaxaria*,¹⁰⁷ of the transfer, by Bishop Dometius, of Adrian's relics to Argyropolis. In the *Synaxaria* Adrian is said to have been Dometius' brother, and his relics are reported to have been deposited in the church of Argyropolis near the relics of St. Stachys. This story of the *Synaxaria* appears also in Pseudo-Dorotheus,¹⁰⁸ but there is no reference to it at all in the *Typicon*, which simply reports that the feast of Adrian, who had suffered persecution under Licinius, was celebrated on that day.

Quite possibly, therefore, the story of Metrophanes' origin circulated independently in Constantinople, and was not invented by Pseudo-Dorotheus, but merely included by him in his catalogue. Metrophanes was well-known, and it is conceivable that legendary accounts of his origin became popular. The story about him in the *Typicon* could have been copied from the Life of Metrophanes which was also used by Pseudo-Dorotheus.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁴ Ed. Schermann, pp. 150 seq.

¹⁰⁵ Delehaye, *op. cit.*, cols. 727 seq.

¹⁰⁶ Dmitrijevskij, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

¹⁰⁷ Delehaye, *op. cit.*, col. 926.

¹⁰⁸ Ed. Schermann, pp. 145 seq. Cf. *Acta Sanctorum Augusti*, 5, cols. 808-811 (*dies* 26).

¹⁰⁹ Cf. L. S. Le Nain de Tillemont (*Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique*, 5 [Paris, 1702], p. 783) on Adrian whom he identifies with another martyr of the same name (p. 508 seq.). It seems that in the Life of Metrophanes used by the author of the *Typicon* there was no mention of Adrian, Metrophanes' supposed uncle. See *ibid.*, 7, pp. 656 seq., Tillemont's remarks on Metrophanes. Unfortunately, Photius' extracts from Gelasius' Church History (*Bibliotheca*, cod. 88, PG. 103, cols. 289 seq.) give no indication as to whether or not this legendary account of Metrophanes was known to

GROWTH OF THE ANDREW LEGEND

Thus it can be concluded that, although the thesis of Byzantium's apostolic character was fairly generally accepted in the East in the ninth century, and, although for many this apostolic character derived from Andrew and Stachys, the Andrew tradition had not been adopted universally in Byzantium at that time. Its general acceptance seems not to have been positively achieved until the tenth century.

Two facts illustrate this new tenth-century development. First, the re-edition of Andrew's Life and Martyrdom by Symeon Metaphrastes.¹¹⁰ Symeon's work is based on the composition of Epiphanius and on the *Laudatio*, but the range of Andrew's apostolic activity is considerably extended by the hagiographer. The Apostle is said to have been allotted "all the land of Bithynia, the *Pontus Euxeinus*, both sides of the Propontis, as far as the Gulf of Astacos and the passage to the sea there. Added to this were far-famed Chalcedon and Byzantium, and the nations inhabiting Thrace and Macedonia, and extending from there as far as the Danube; also Thessaly and Hellas, and the lands extending from there to Achaea."

Symeon describes Andrew's travels in three phases, interrupted by his pilgrimage to Jerusalem to celebrate Easter with the other apostles. However, he shortens the legendary accounts of the Apostle's activities in the cities he was supposed to have visited. Andrew is said to have preached to the Lazi, the Alans, the Abasgi, the Zechoi, and the Bosporians, and then to have returned to Sinope from Cherson. Then he went to Byzantium, where he ordained Stachys and constructed the Church of Our Lady on the city's acropolis. The stories of Argyropolis and Zeuxippus are omitted, but the transfer of Andrew's relics to Constantinople is recorded.

The second important factor in popularizing the Andrew Legend, was its inclusion in the *Synaxaria*. The accounts of the Legend are

Gelasius of Cyzicus, a fifth-century writer. Neither can it be stated definitely whether it was known to the anonymous writer of Metrophanes' and Alexander's *Politeia*, from which also Photius preserved a long extract (*ibid.*, codex 256, PG. 104, cols. 105-120).

¹¹⁰ *Menaia*, (ed. Venice, 1843), pp. 235 seq. Reprinted in *Μηναίων τοῦ Νοεμβρίου* (Athens, 1926), pp. 318-325: ὑπόμνημα εἰς τὸν ἅγιον Ἀπόστολον Ἀνδρέαν τὸν Πρωτόκλητον.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

based on the lists of apostles of Pseudo-Dorotheus, combined with that of Pseudo-Hipolytus. In numerous copies additional information is taken from Metaphrastes' descriptions of Andrew's preaching; also from the story of Stachys.¹¹¹

From the tenth century onward the *Synaxaria* add to the list of the apostles commemorated on June 30th the list of the seventy disciples, including, of course, Stachys, the twenty-second in the list, and the story of his ordination by Andrew.¹¹² The feast of Stachys is also introduced, and Stachys' relics in Argyropolis are mentioned in connection with the transfer of Adrian's relics, as noted above.¹¹³

It cannot be said whether the feast of Stachys was commemorated in the eleventh-century *Menologion*, published by B. Latyšev, for it is only fragmentarily preserved. The folios that contained the feasts of October and November, and that would be of principal interest for this study, are missing. For June 30th this *Menologion*¹¹⁴ commemorates only the twelve apostles without mentioning the seventy disciples. Although the list of the apostles is different from that of the *Synaxaria*, published by Delehaye, the influence of the recently fully-developed Andrew Legend can be detected in it because here also the Apostle is made to reach Greece from Pontus through Byzantium.

The Andrew Legend is firmly embedded, too, in the *Menologion* of Basil II, an important document of the late tenth century. The feast of Stachys is duly noted on October 30th, together with the description of his ordination by Andrew. Andrew's commemoration is also mentioned in terms similar to those used in the *Synaxaria*, but Byzantium is not mentioned in this document,

¹¹¹ Delehaye, *op. cit.*, cols. 265 seq. See the comparison of the different accounts in J. Flamion, *Les actes apocryphes de l'Apôtre André* (1911), pp. 238-241.

¹¹² H. Delehaye, *op. cit.*, col. 785 (Stachys). Col. 780, Andrew is said to have preached in Bithynia, Pontus, and Armenia, and to have reached Greece through Pontus and Byzantium.

¹¹³ P. 256.

¹¹⁴ B. Latyšev, *Menologii Byzantini saeculi X quae supersunt*, 2 (St. Petersburg, 1912), p. 123. *Ibid.*, pp. 319-325 on the martyrdom of Adrian and Natalia. The other Adrian, believed to have been the brother of Dometius, Bishop of Byzantium mentioned in the Synaxaries, is omitted from this *Menologion*. The Bishops, Titus, Dometius, and Probus are, however, mentioned in the Life of Metrophanes (*ibid.*, pp. 12 seq.)

GROWTH OF THE ANDREW LEGEND

although Thrace is named among the missionary lands of Andrew, while Argyropolis and Stachys are again recorded in the account of the transfer of Adrian's relics.¹¹⁵

The Stachys Legend is also reflected in the anonymous tenth-century work on Constantinople's topography. In this Andrew is reported to have taught at the place where Constantine the Great later erected the church of St. George, and to have ordained St. Stachys in the church of St. Irene at Galata.¹¹⁶

The anonymous list of the apostles and the disciples that circulated from the end of the tenth century and was connected with the name of Symeon the Logothete also reveals the influence of Pseudo-Dorotheus. Although in enumerating the apostles and disciples the author followed, rather, the Syriac tradition, Stachys is mentioned with Andrew and Argyropolis,¹¹⁷ as was the case in Pseudo-Dorotheus.

To the enumeration of these documents should be added also the anonymous Church History believed to have been composed at the beginning of the tenth century, and re-edited by Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopulus at the beginning of the fourteenth. This work contains Pseudo-Dorotheus' list of bishops beginning with Stachys' ordination in Argyropolis, although Nicephorus Callistus contradicts himself in this respect because, as already mentioned,¹¹⁸ he says in another passage that Argyropolis did not obtain its name until the fifth century.¹¹⁹

It would be wise, however, to take great care in evaluating this Church History. Recent research has shown that Nicephorus Callistus tended to use in his composition the works of older Greek Church historians, and that his work is important for the reconstruction of the texts of their writings because he often copied

¹¹⁵ *Menologium Graecum*, PG, 117, cols. 136 seq. 185, 605.

¹¹⁶ *Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum*, 2, ed. Th. Preger (Teubner, Leipzig, 1907), pp. 270 seq.

¹¹⁷ Ed. Th. Schermann, *Indices apostol.*, pp. 180 seq.

¹¹⁸ See *supra*, p. 219. PG, 146, col. 28; 147, col. 1133; cf. 145, col. 860.

¹¹⁹ The list of Pseudo-Dorotheus is reproduced also in an independent catalogue of bishops of Constantinople from about 901, preserved in *Codex Bodleianus* 715, fols 7-9. See C. E. Zachariae von Lingenthal, 'Ο Πρόχειρος Νόμος (Heidelberg, 1837), p. 325. For the further development of the cult of Stachys see *Acta Sanctorum Octobris*, 13, pp. 694 seq. (*Dies* 31, "De Ss. Stachy, Ampliato, Urbano, et Narcisso).

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

whole passages from them *verbatim*.¹²⁰ If this is so, the existence of an anonymous tenth-century Church History becomes very doubtful, and it would have to be assumed that Nicephorus Callistus had simply copied the list of the Byzantine bishops from the catalogue of Pseudo-Dorotheus.

In the face of all this evidence it would appear that, from the tenth century onward, the Byzantines had accepted Pseudo-Dorotheus' tradition as the only true one. It is, therefore, the more surprising to find in the historical work of Pseudo-Symeon,¹²¹ dating from the beginning of the second half of the tenth century, another list of Byzantine bishops which is shorter and mentions only three third-century bishops. Pseudo-Symeon designates Philadelphus as the first Bishop of Byzantium during the reign of Caracalla (211-217). Philadelphus is said to have been Bishop for three years and to have been preceded in Byzantium by a simple priest who administered the community for eight years. Another Bishop, of the reign of the Emperor Gordian, is said to have been Eugenius, who occupied the see for twenty-five years. The third Bishop—Rufinus—was appointed under Numerianus in 284, and governed the Church of Byzantium for nine years.

Pseudo-Symeon was followed by Cedrenus,¹²² who wrote his historical work at the end of the eleventh, or the beginning of the twelfth century. He, too, reports on only three bishops before Metrophanes, mentioning Philadelphus and Eugenius by name.

This list is generally rejected as being not genuine¹²³ because it does not tally with the names quoted in that of Pseudo-Dorotheus. But this very fact rather indicates that Pseudo-Symeon's list may contain some grains of truth. The city of Byzantium is known to have produced its first heretic at the end of the second century,

¹²⁰ Günter Gentz, K. Aland, "Die Quellen der Kirchengeschichte des Nicephorus und ihre Bedeutung für die Konstituierung des Textes der älteren Kirchenhistoriker," *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 42 (1949), pp. 104-141.

¹²¹ See A. Banduri, *Imperium orientale*, 2 (Paris, 1711), p. 888. This part of the Chronicle has, unfortunately, not yet been published.

¹²² *Historiarum compendium*, (ed. Bonn), pp. 449, 451, 477, PG, 121, cols. 489, 493, 520.

¹²³ Cf. P. Cuyper in *Acta Sanctorum*, 1, *Augusti*, col. 11.

GROWTH OF THE ANDREW LEGEND

namely Theodotus, who taught that Christ was a mere man into whom the Holy Ghost had entered at the moment of his baptism in the Jordan. Theodotus came to Rome about the year 190,¹²⁴ which permits the supposition that Byzantium already had a Christian community about 180. Christianity probably penetrated there from Heracleia,¹²⁵ and it was this city which became the metropolis of Byzantium and provided for its religious needs. In the light of this, Pseudo-Symeon's information does not appear as far-fetched as it first seemed. When the many persecutions suffered by the Christians in the third century are recalled, it is not remarkable that the series of bishops should have been interrupted in many communities, that vacancies should have occurred, or that some names should simply not have been recorded.¹²⁶ It is, therefore, reasonable to assume that Metrophanes may have had predecessors, and the names quoted by Pseudo-Symeon seem more reliable than those in Pseudo-Dorotheus' list.

The fact that Pseudo-Symeon and Cedrenus apparently knew nothing of Metrophanes' brother Probus, of his father Dometius, and of Bishop Titus, all of whom were quoted in Metrophanes' Life as his predecessors in episcopacy, shows that the source of Pseudo-Symeon said nothing regarding Metrophanes' ancestry. This confirms the legendary character of the story concerning Metrophanes' origin. It may be, however, that, as has already been suggested, this story originated independently of Pseudo-Dorotheus' compilation, and was merely incorporated into it.¹²⁷

In the tenth century the tradition, launched by Pseudo-Dorotheus, reached the Syrians also, replacing their old tradition which attributed the preaching of the Gospel in Byzantium to St. Luke. This new idea in Syriac descriptions of apostolic activities can be traced

¹²⁴ Hippolytus, *Philosophoumena*, 7, chap. 35, PG, 16, col. 3342, GCS, 26, ed. P. Wendland (1916), p. 222.

¹²⁵ Cf. A. von Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* (Leipzig, 1924), pp. 485, 791, on Christianity in Heracleia and Byzantium.

¹²⁶ S. Vailhé, "Origines de l'Eglise de Constantinople," *Echos d'Orient*, 10 (1902), pp. 293 seq.

¹²⁷ See *supra* p. 256.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

in the tenth-century Universal History by Agapius of Menbidj.¹²⁸ Agapius confuses, however, the transfer of Andrew's relics to Constantinople with his death; he believes that Andrew died in Constantinople.

Another Syrian writer, Michael the Syrian, who lived in the twelfth century, also took the Andrew-Stachys story for granted, for he copied a part of Pseudo-Dorotheus' list into his work.¹²⁹ The Pseudo-Epiphanius tradition must have been familiar to him too, since, in another passage, he has Andrew preach in Nicaea, in Nicomedia, in Scythia, and in Achaea.¹³⁰ His contemporary, Dionysius Barçalibi, quoted by Michael,¹³¹ was influenced in his account of Andrew by the Acts of Andrew and Matthias, for he reports that the Saint preached in Beit-Kalbîn (house of the dogs) and along the seashore. He says that the inhabitants cut Andrew to pieces. Epiphanius' thesis was also accepted by Salomon of Basrah¹³² (d. ca. 1222) and by Bar-Hebraeus (d. 1286).¹³³

Probably during the tenth century, the Georgians, too, became acquainted with the Andrew Legend.¹³⁴ They were naturally

¹²⁸ "Kitab al Unvan," published and translated by A. Vasiliev (*Patrologia Orientalis*, 7, p. 491); "À cette époque mourut l'apôtre André, qui était évêque de Byzance, après deux ans d'épiscopat. Stychus [*sic!*] y fut évêque pendant quinze ans. Après lui Onesime pendant treize ans." Cf. also F. Haase, *Apostel und Evangelisten in den orientalischen Überlieferungen* (Münster i. W., 1922), p. 252.

¹²⁹ Ed. J. B. Chabot, 1 (Paris, 1899), bk. 6, chap. 4, p. 174. F. Haase, *op. cit.*, p. 293, quotes a similar story on Andrew and Stachys from the Vatican Syriac Codex 1591 (fol. 452a). Cf. also his quotation on Andrew (p. 296) from *Codex Vaticanus Arabicus* 623, p. 71.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 146: "André prêcha à Nicée, à Nicomédie, en Scythie et en Achaïe; le premier il siégea à Constantinople et il y mourrut."

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 148: "André prêcha dans le pays de Beit-Kalbîn et sur le littoral; plus tard les Kalbè lui coupèrent les membres en morceaux."

¹³² *The Book of the Bee*, ed. E. A. Wallis Budge (in *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, Semitic Series, 1, pt. 2), chap. 48, p. 104: "Andrew, his [Peter's] brother, preached in Scythia and Nicomedia and Achaea. He built a church in Byzantium and there he died and was buried."

¹³³ *Gregorii Barhebraei Chronicon ecclesiasticum*, 1, ed. J. B. Abbeloos and T. J. Lany (Louvain, 1872), pp. 31 seq: *Andreas praedicavit Nicaeae, Nicomediae, in Scythia et Achaia, ac primus sedem fixit Constantinopoli ibidem mortem obiit*. The Syriac authors often misconstrued the fact that Andrew's relics were in Constantinople, considering it to be evidence of his having died there.

¹³⁴ See the documentation in A. Pogodin's study "Povest o chozdenii apostola Andreja v Rusi," *Byzantinoslavica*, 7 (1937-1938), pp. 137-141.

GROWTH OF THE ANDREW LEGEND

interested in Andrew's travels to Sebastopolis and along the Caucasian shore, described in Epiphanius' Life and in the *Synaxaria*. The Georgians were soon aware of the importance of this account for their Church, and based their claims for its autonomy on the principle of apostolicity, pretending that their Church was founded by St. Andrew.¹³⁵

From Georgia, through the intermediary of the Russian principality of Tmutorakan on the Taman peninsula, or more probably directly from Greece, the Andrew Legend was transmitted to Kiev, and is reflected in the Russian Primary Chronicle.¹³⁶ There it is said that "when Andrew was teaching in Sinope, and came to Cherson, he observed that the mouth of the Dnieper was nearby. Conceiving a desire to go to Rome, he proceeded, therefore, to the mouth of the Dnieper and thence journeyed up the river, and by chance halted upon the shore beneath the hills. He prophesied to his disciples that on that spot a great city with many churches [Kiev] would arise. He blessed the spot, erecting there a cross, then continued his journey to Novgorod, and, after a stay with the Varangians, reached Rome. Leaving Rome, he returned to Sinope." It is evident that this new development of the Andrew Legend was built on the basis of the Greek accounts of the monk Epiphanius, and on those of the author of the *Laudatio*. In both works Cherson is mentioned together with Sinope, and it must have been this fact that inspired the Russian chronicler to have Andrew come to the place where Kiev was to stand, and to lead him through the whole of

The Greek *Synaxarion* was translated into Georgian in the eleventh century. It is published in the *Sbornik materialov dlja opisanija mestnostej i plemen Kavkaza*, 26 (Tiflis, 1899), p. 3. Cf. *supra* p. 210.

¹³⁵ On the Georgian Andrew Legends see I. Džavakov, "Propovědničeskaja dĕjatel'nost' ap. Andreja i sv. Niny. II. Apostol Andrej v Gruzii" in *Žurnal ministerstva narodnago prosvěščenija*, 333 (1901), pp. 101-113. Cf. the discussion between a Georgian monk and the Patriarch Theodosius of Antioch (twelfth century) on the foundation of the Georgian Church by Andrew in P. Peeters, "Histoires monastiques géorgiennes," *AnBoll*, 36-37 (1917-1918), pp. 116, 117. More bibliographical data in P. Peeters, "Les débuts du christianisme en Géorgie," *ibid.*, 50 (1932), pp. 6-58.

¹³⁶ Translation by S. H. Cross in *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, 12 (1930), p. 139, new edition by O. P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor (Cambridge, Mass., 1953), pp. 53, 54.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

Russia to Novgorod.¹³⁷ From the tenth and eleventh centuries onward, the Andrew and Stachys Legend was generally accepted as genuine in Byzantium and throughout the Eastern Church.

¹³⁷ A. Pogodin, *op. cit.*, thinks that the knowledge of this Legend reached Kievan Russia from Georgia via the Russian principality of Tmutorakan. The monk Nikon who is supposed to be the author of the definitive edition of the Russian Primary Chronicle and was identified by Pogodin with the Kievan Metropolitan Hilarion, who came from Tmutorakan, is said to have transmitted the legend to Kiev. This is possible, but seems improbable. The mention of Cherson and Sinope points more directly to Byzantium and Cherson than to Georgia as the point of transmission. Kiev was in intimate relationship with Cherson from at least the tenth century onward, and there must have existed in Cherson a local tradition concerning Andrew, for his name was connected with that city. It is not known to me whether Cherson is mentioned in the Georgian version.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE IDEA OF APOSTOLICITY AND THE ANDREW LEGEND IN THE CONTROVERSIES BETWEEN CONSTANTINOPLE AND ROME.

The idea of apostolicity as the basis of the pentarchic order — The pentarchic idea at the Ignatian Council of 869–870 — The definition of the duties of emperors and patriarchs in the *Epanagoge* reflects a new spirit created by the growth of apostolicity — Possibilities of a rapprochement on this new basis — The argument of apostolicity in the controversies of the tenth and eleventh centuries — The position of the see of Constantinople in Church organization and the Western canonists of the eleventh century — Eastern writers of the eleventh and twelfth centuries — The Andrew Legend and the controversies during the thirteenth century — How the character of universal teachers attributed to the apostles by Greek polemicists diminished the value of the Andrew tradition for the Greeks — The Andrew Legend in the fourteenth century in Byzantium — The Councils of Lyons and Florence on the see of Constantinople — Acceptance of the Andrew Legend by the Latin West.

Before concluding this investigation, it would be of interest to trace the role played by the growth of the idea of apostolicity and by the Andrew Legend in the relationship between the Eastern and the Western Church. It is quite natural that these developments could not have been viewed with great favor in Rome. They deprived the popes of a strong argument in their contest with Constantinople for the privileged position of Rome in the Church.

This whole problem should, however, be studied from the Byzantine standpoint, and should be viewed especially in the light of Byzantine ideas on the position of the emperor. The prominent place enjoyed by the emperor as the representative of God in the Christian commonwealth should first be borne in mind. On this basis we will have to admit that the final acceptance of the idea of apostolicity in Byzantium represented in reality a victory

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

of the principle for which the Eastern Church had always fought, with varying degrees of success—the principle that decisions in matters of faith were a responsibility of the bishops as successors of the apostles; not of the emperors, whose role was merely to promulgate these decisions, to secure their acceptance by the faithful, and to defend them.

The acceptance of the principle of apostolicity in Church organization in Byzantium has been shown to have been connected ultimately with the growth of the idea that the direction of Church affairs, especially insofar as they concerned the definition and interpretation of Church doctrine, should be reserved to the incumbents of the principal sees who, at the same time, represented the bishops of their respective dioceses. This privileged position, as has been seen, was gradually assigned to five sees—Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople, and Jerusalem—with Constantinople taking precedence over the other three Oriental sees. Thus did the idea of the pentarchy originate, and its main features can be found in the Acts of the Sixth Oecumenical Council. How quickly this principle was adopted in the East may be gathered from Justinian's legislation. On at least three occasions Justinian clearly alludes to the five "archbishops and patriarchs" who are directed to make his legislative measures known to the metropolitans of their dioceses, and to supervise their observance, and if he is relatively temperate in this respect in his famous sixth novel¹ outlining the relationship between the *imperium* and the *sacerdotium*, he is very forceful in novel 109² where he expressly mentions the five patriarchs "of the whole universe." Novel 109 is especially important, for in it the Emperor seems to move toward the idea of apostolicity incorporated in the five patriarchs. Three times in his novel he calls the Church, which he assumes to be directed by the five patriarchs, "catholic and apostolic." The five "archbishops and patriarchs" are addressed also in novel 123.³

Here are the foundations of the pentarchic idea, whose spread in the East was intimately connected with the idea of apostolicity and

¹ *Novella 6, epilogus, Corpus Iuris civilis, 3 (Novellae)*, ed. R. Schoell and J. Kroll (Berlin, 1928), p. 47.

² *Nov. 109, praefatio, ibid.*, p. 518.

³ *Nov. 123, 3, ibid.*, p. 597.

ANDREW LEGEND IN EAST AND WEST

with the attribution of an apostolic character to the see of Constantinople. Justinian had thus, unwittingly, created favorable conditions for the growth of an idea which was destined ultimately to help the Eastern Church in its struggle for emancipation from imperial interference in matters of faith.

Further clear traces of the growth of the pentarchic idea are to be found in the works of the seventh-century theologian Maximus the Confessor. In his disputation with Pyrrhus,⁴ Maximus assumes that the Church is governed by the patriarchs who are its highest authority. In his letter to John Cubicularius⁵ the Saint attempts to coordinate the authority of the patriarchs in the Church with that of the emperor.

It has already been shown that the idea of apostolicity helped the defenders of image-worship in their struggle against the last direct interference of the emperors in matters of faith. During this struggle the doctrine of the pentarchic (five-headed) authority governing the Church was fully developed by the defenders of image-worship, and was vigorously propagated by St. Theodore of Studios, who saw in it one of the most telling arguments against imperial intervention in Church teaching.

This new trend in Byzantine political and ecclesiastical thinking came to full fruition in the ninth century. Then, too, the apostolic character of the see of Constantinople was taken for granted by the Byzantines and at least vaguely recognized by the eastern patriarchs, although its basis does not seem to have been clearly defined in official circles, despite the fact that the Andrew and Stachys tradition was gradually gaining more ground among the faithful and in ecclesiastical circles. This was the final stage in the evolution that began in 381 when the Fathers of the Second Oecumenical Council accorded to the see of Constantinople a rank second only to that of Rome.

It was during the ninth century also that the new doctrine of the pentarchic authority in the Church was fully developed on the basis of the apostolic principle. This new conception is best mirrored

⁴ *Disputatio cum Pyrrho*, PG, 91, col. 352.

⁵ Letter 12, *ibid.*, col. 464.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

in the Acts of the Ignatian Council of 869–870, called the Eighth Oecumenical Council. In the Acts of this Council we find the fullest definition of the new doctrine of the pentarchy, as can be shown by quotations of statements made by leading personalities.

The spokesman of the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Elias, attributed the institution of the patriarchs to the Holy Ghost, bringing them into intimate connection with the apostles:⁶ “All of you, friends of Christ and brethren, know that the Holy Ghost who spoke through the prophets, has also spoken through the intermediary of the apostles, and that all which in the past was done by our Fathers is not only laid down as law, but also remains enacted by spiritual grace. And therefore the Holy Spirit instituted as heads of the world the patriarchs that, through them, the scandals which multiply in the Church might be eradicated, and that peaceful conditions might be restored and secured.” Then Elias enumerated the five patriarchs.

The most prominent supporter of the Patriarch Ignatius, Metrophanes of Smyrna, proclaimed during the sixth session of the Council⁷ that God “the sun of justice . . . had instituted the five patriarchs like five great luminaries to illuminate the whole world, that they may preside over day and night and separate the light from the darkness; namely those who perform acts of light, that is of divine justice, from those who perform acts of darkness, that is of injustice. . . .”

During the same session the Emperor Basil addressed the followers of Photius as follows:⁸ “Certainly you know, as does the whole world under the sun, that by the guidance of the one true God the five patriarchs of the whole world are right. . . . You must, therefore, accept their judgment.” Basil’s representative at the Council, the Patrician Baanes, was even more outspoken when he declared:⁹ “God has established His Church on five patriarchs and He has defined in His Holy Gospels that they would never fail altogether, because they are the heads of the Church.”

Among the canons voted by the Council, canon twenty-one deals

⁶ Mansi 16, cols. 35A, 317E.

⁷ *Ibid.*, cols. 82C, 344E.

⁸ *Ibid.*, cols. 86E, 87A.

⁹ *Ibid.* col. 140E.

ANDREW LEGEND IN EAST AND WEST

with the patriarchs.¹⁰ The Fathers not only enumerated in this canon the five patriarchs, but launched a solemn anathema against any secular power that might presume to dishonor or dethrone one of the five supreme pastors of the Church. It should be stressed that the patriarchs are enumerated here in the "Greek fashion," the patriarch of Constantinople preceding the three other eastern patriarchs.¹¹

The new ecclesiastical order based on the pentarchic idea is confirmed in several other canons voted by the Ignatian Council. In canon ten¹² the Fathers forbade priests to refuse obedience to their bishops, or bishops to their metropolitans or patriarchs, unless such bishops and metropolitans were condemned by a synodal decree. The wording of this canon shows clearly that the Council had in mind the ecclesiastical hierarchy in which the patriarchs occupied the highest positions.

Canon seventeen¹³ starts with a quotation from canon six of the First Council of Nicaea. In a very adroit way, however, the see of New Rome is mentioned immediately after that of Old Rome, and before the sees of Antioch and Jerusalem—Alexandria is quoted at the beginning of the canon—in the renewed confirmation of all instructions giving to the five patriarchs the right to punish all metropolitans or bishops of their patriarchates and to convoke them in a synod. In this canon the Fathers seem to regard all patriarchs as "apostolic," enjoining all bishops against refusing the invitation of their *apostolicus* on the pretext of being prevented by civil power from attending a synod.

Canon twenty-six¹⁴ also favors the pentarchic order. In this the

¹⁰ *Ibid.* col. 174.

¹¹ At the end of this canon the following injunction concerning Rome occurs: *Porro si synodus universalis fuerit congregata, et facta fuerit etiam de sancta Romanorum ecclesia quaevis ambiguitas et controversia, oportet venerabiliter, et cum convenienti reverentia de proposita quaestione sciscitari, et solutionem accipere, aut proficere, aut profectum facere, non tamen audacter sententiam dicere contra summos senioris Romae pontifices.* This seems to be addressed to the synod of 867. The wording appears to indicate, however, that the target of the condemnation pronounced by the synod was not the see of Rome or the papacy as such, but the person of Nicholas I. See also the shortened Greek text, *ibid.*, col. 405 (Canon 13).

¹² *Ibid.*, col. 166.

¹³ *Ibid.*, cols. 170E, 171A.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, cols. 177, 178.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

Fathers set forth the rules concerning the right of appeal to the patriarch by clerics condemned by their bishops, and strictly forbid any appeal to the judgment of metropolitans or bishops outside the clerics' own provinces. The only proper judge was the patriarch in whose diocese the clerics lived, and his decision was final. Curiously enough there is in this canon no mention of an appeal to the first patriarch of Old Rome, although the Synod of 861—condemned, of course, by that of 869–870—had clearly acknowledged the see of Rome as the supreme judge over a patriarch.

It is interesting to note that Pope Hadrian II, in his letter to Emperor Basil I, manifested no disapproval of these canons. He expressed, on the contrary, his joy over the fact that at the Council "the catholic and true faith was defined, and the tradition of the Fathers and the rights which will profit the Church were established and confirmed for all future time." The Pope's words cannot, of course, be interpreted as a confirmation of the Council, but it is reasonable to conclude from them that he was not altogether hostile to the pentarchic idea with which the canons that he had praised were permeated.

Ideas similar to those expressed in the Acts of the Ignatian Council can also be found in the passage, quoted above, of Photius' letter to Zachary of Armenia, which seems to be genuine. The declaration that God established the four patriarchates, to which the fifth was added, "by which the Apostolic and Catholic Church is governed," is almost identical with the eloquent statements on the five patriarchs made during the Council of 869–870.

The same spirit animates too the statements about the first Four General Councils in the second part of the letter to Zachary.¹⁵ This, however, does not appear to be genuine, although it reflects ideas on councils similar to those expressed by Photius in his letter to the Bulgarian Khagan Boris-Michael.¹⁶ The idea of the five patriarchs'

¹⁵ This part is reprinted in *PG*, 102, cols. 707–714 from A. Mai's Latin translation.

¹⁶ *PG*, 102, cols. 631, seq. G. Garitte, "*La Narratio de rebus Armeniae*. Edition critique et commentaire," *CSCO.*, 132, pp. 107 seq., has shown convincingly that in the dating of the Councils the author of the letter to Zachary copies the same mistakes found in the *Narratio de rebus Armeniae*.

ANDREW LEGEND IN EAST AND WEST

supremacy in the Church is expressed even more forcibly in this part of the letter to Zachary. Its author, in listing Alexander of Constantinople¹⁷ among the patriarchs present at the Council of Nicaea, endows Constantinople with patriarchal dignity before that Council. Even if it be assumed that this part of the letter was, like the first part, doctored by an Armenian interpolator, the tendency manifested in stressing the leading role of the five patriarchs in the Church is significant.¹⁸ The author added the catholicos of Armenia as the sixth patriarch.

The extent of the increased prestige of the Church authorities in Byzantium after the victory over Iconoclasm is best illustrated by the definition of the patriarch's duties in the third title of the *Epanagoge*. This document is one of two that had been drafted and submitted as a new legislative handbook by two imperial committees appointed by Basil I. It was not the *Epanagoge*, but the alternative document, the *Procheiron*, that was finally chosen by the Emperor.¹⁹ In spite of this, however, the *Epanagoge* was also used, and exercised some influence.

Titles two and three of the *Epanagoge*²⁰ define the functions of the emperor and the patriarch in Byzantine life and are followed by other titles determining the functions of other state officials, of bishops, and of monks. The importance of this document in the evolution of the relations between Church and State in Byzantium is often exaggerated. In reality many of these definitions can be traced to Justinian's novels. Chapter eight of the third title shows clearly that the author of this title was inspired by the introduction

¹⁷ Alexander's presence at the Council of Nicaea is also noted in the letter to Boris-Michael, but there he is called only the administrator of this see. This is entirely credible, for Bishop Metrophanes was too old to be present. It should be stressed, too, that in this part of the letter to Zachary the popes are always listed first, as if they had assisted in person at each Council.

¹⁸ A clear echo of the pentarchic doctrine can also be detected in the Life of St. John, Bishop of Gothia, written in the ninth century (*AS Junius, dies* 26, 7, chap. 4, p. 168).

¹⁹ See on this problem the well-documented study "O pravni naravi Epanagoge," published by C. Kržišnik in *Slovenski pravnik*, 49 (Ljubljana, 1935), pp. 335-349.

²⁰ Ed. C. E. Zachariae von Lingenthal, in J. Zepos, P. Zepos, *Jus Graecoromanum*, 2 (Athens, 1931), p. 242.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

to Justinian's sixth novel.²¹ However, a new tone can be discerned in chapter three of the third title: "The patriarch alone is entitled to interpret the rules of the old patriarchs, the prescriptions of the Holy Fathers and the decisions of the holy synods." The duties of the emperor are set out in the fourth chapter of the second title: "The emperor must defend and enforce, first, all that is written in the Holy Writ, then, all dogmas approved by the holy councils, and also the selected Roman laws." This demonstrates clearly the tendency to limit imperial intervention in religious matters purely to the defense and enforcement of the accepted definitions of faith: only the Church—here incarnate in the patriarch—has the right to interpret synodal definitions.

This right was of course basically recognized by the emperors, but they often provoked or backed decisions made by heretical bishops. The defeat of the last direct imperial intervention in matters of faith during the iconoclastic controversy encouraged the author of this part of the *Epanagoge* to make this bold interpretation which, it was hoped, would put a definite end to such interference.

This part of the *Epanagoge* seems to have been inspired by the Patriarch Photius, who had contributed considerably to the final liquidation of Iconoclasm in Byzantium.²² It would be, however, an exaggeration to see in this definition an attempt to emancipate the Church from the tutelage of the State, or the beginning of a new

²¹ *Nov.* 6, ed. Krüger, 3, pp. 35 seq.: "God's greatest gifts to men stem from His infinite goodness and watch over them . . . the *sacerdotium* and the *imperium*, of which the first serves divine, the second human, interests; both derive from the same principle and perfect human life. Hence nothing claims the emperor's care so much as the honor of the priests, since these continually pray God for him. If the clergy is sound and fully trusts in God, and if the emperor rules the Republic entrusted to him with justice and honor, mutual harmony will arise, which can prove only useful to the human race. . . ." Chapter eight of the third title of the *Epanagoge* (*op. cit.*, p. 242): "The State is composed, like Man, of parts and members. The greatest and most important members are the emperor and the patriarch. Therefore harmony in all things and symphony between the *imperium* and the *sacerdotium* will bring the subjects spiritual and material peace and prosperity." Similar emphasis on harmony and cooperation between the *sacerdotium* and the *imperium* can be detected also in *nov.* 42 (*ibid.*, p. 263).

²² See F. Dvornik, "The Patriarch Photius and Iconoclasm," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 7 (1953), pp. 67-97.

ANDREW LEGEND IN EAST AND WEST

era in the relations between Church and State in Byzantium.²³ Nevertheless, it must be recognized that, although the *Epanagoge* did not become an official law handbook for Byzantine courts, the principles stressed in titles two and three did exercise a marked influence. The *Epanagoge* was used as a source by later compilers of law handbooks, and many of its titles were incorporated into later Byzantine law books.

With regard to titles two and three, the *Epitome legum*, a law book dating from the beginning of the tenth century, contains chapters one and three of the *Epanagoge's* title two, listed as the twentieth

²³ Such is the opinion of G. Vernadsky as expressed in his studies "Vizantijskija učenija o vlasti carja i patriarcha," in *Sbornik statej posveščennykh pamjati N. P. Kondakova* (Prague, 1926), pp. 143-154, and "Die kirchlich-politische Lehre der Epanagoge und ihr Einfluss auf das russische Leben im XVII. Jahrhundert," *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher*, 6 (1927), pp. 119-142. H. F. Schmid expressed a different opinion in his review of Vernadsky's first study (*Zeitschrift für Savigny-Stiftung und Rechtsgeschichte, Kanon. Abt.* 16 [1927], pp. 530-535). Similar ideas to those of Vernadsky are found in G. Ostrogorsky's study "Otnošenje cerkvi i gosudarstva v Vizantii," *Seminarij Kondakovianum*, 4 (1931), pp. 121-134. These were rightly criticized by F. Dölger (*Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 31 [1931], pp. 449-450). All the more surprising therefore is Dölger's statement in his "Europas Gestaltung im Spiegel der fränkisch-byzantinischen Auseinandersetzung des 9. Jahrhunderts" (published in *Der Vertrag von Verdun 843*, ed. Th. Mayer [Leipzig, 1943], pp. 228 seq., and reprinted in F. Dölger, *Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt* [Speyer a. R., 1953], pp. 315 seq.): "Das Lebensziel des Photios war nicht nur...die Primatsansprüche des römischen Papstes zu brechen, sondern auch, das im Westen zum Durchbruch gekommene Prinzip einer der weltlichen selbständig gegenüberstehenden geistlichen Gewalt auch in Byzanz zur Geltung zu bringen, also ein östlicher Papst zu werden.... Ein Beweis für seine Absichten hinsichtlich der Emanzipation des Patriarchats aus der geistlichen Oberleitung des byzantinischen Kaisers findet sich in Proimium zur Epanagoge.... Da sich zu dieser Beobachtung noch andere Indizien für das ehrgeizige Streben des Patriarchen Photios gesellen, dürfen wir annehmen, daß er versuchte, ein Recht, das dem Wesen des byzantinischen Kaisertum widersprach, in ein allgemeines Gesetzwerk sozusagen einzuschmuggeln." See also F. Dölger, "Rom in der Gedankenwelt der Byzantiner" (*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 56 [1937], p. 32, reprinted in his *Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt*, p. 103): "Er war es auch, der in Byzanz selbst versuchte, eine der sichersten Säulen des byzantinischen Staatsrechts, die Unterordnung der Kirche unter den Staat, zu stürzen; die Spuren davon finden wir in der unter seiner Leitung zusammengestellten Epanagoge...." This is something of an overstatement. Photius tried to define clearly a principle for which his Church was always fighting, namely that the definition of faith and the interpretation of conciliar decrees belonged to the Church, represented in the East by the patriarch of Constantinople—in the ninth century the most prominent of the four eastern patriarchs. In this respect however Photius did not succeed, because his formulation of the rights of a patriarch—as Dölger rightly remarks—appeared strange to the Emperor and to the Byzantines in general.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

and twenty-first *scholia* to the first part of the handbook.²⁴ Some manuscripts of the *Synopsis Basilicorum*, an abridgment of the *Basilica*, composed in alphabetical order during the second half of the tenth century, added to the text some marginal notes from the two titles of the *Epanagoge*.²⁵

In the *Synopsis minor* quotations from the two titles in question are incorporated into the text of the collection. The first five chapters defining the duties of the emperor, and chapters one to four and eight of title three,²⁶ on the patriarch, are to be found there. It is characteristic that chapter five stressing the prerogative of the patriarch to interpret the definitions of the councils is not reproduced by the anonymous author of the *Synopsis minor*. Matthew Blastares, who composed his *Syntagma* about the middle of the fourteenth century, also incorporated into his handbook of canon law the first four chapters of the third title of the *Epanagoge* plus chapter eight, later adding chapters nine and ten.²⁷ Again we note that he omitted chapter five.

Is the omission of chapter five from the *Synopsis minor* and the *Syntagma* due simply to coincidence? Possibly; but it could also be that the prerogative granted to the patriarch in chapter five had encountered some opposition in Constantinople from bishops who presumed to participate in the explanation of the conciliar definitions. Such a supposition would conform to the thinking prevalent in Constantinople, where it was always customary to grant only to bishops assembled in council the right to interpret the true doctrine. If this was so, it must be acknowledged that the author of this chapter—probably Photius^{27a}—did not achieve what he intended.

²⁴ C. E. Zachariae von Lingenthal, *op. cit.*, 2, p. 291, ed. J. Zepos, P. Zepos, 4, p. 289.

²⁵ *Op. cit.*, 5, pp. 130, 542; ed. J. Zepos, P. Zepos, 5, pp. 125, 462. The *Codex Lipsinus* and the *Codex Parisiensis* 1351 add to part B, III, 2, chapters one to seven of the second title of the *Epanagoge*, and to part II, X, 1, chapters one to six of the third title concerning the patriarch. *Codex Labbaeus* adds to its part B, III, 2, chapters one to four of the second title of the *Epanagoge*. Cf. C. Kržišnik, *op. cit.*, p. 345.

²⁶ Ed. Zachariae von Lingenthal, *op. cit.*, 2, pp. 41 seq., 206 seq.; ed. J. Zepos, P. Zepos, 6, pp. 354 seq. (B, 21–25), p. 498 seq., (II, 63–66).

²⁷ Matthaeus Blastares, *Syntagma canonum*, PG, 145, cols. 108, 109 (Title II, chap. 8).

^{27a} J. Scharf's comparison of the *Epanagoge's* wording and style with those of Photius' writings ("Photius und die *Epanagoge*," *BZ*, 49 [1956],

ANDREW LEGEND IN EAST AND WEST

The increased patriarchal privileges granted in chapter five might also have been one of the reasons why Basil did not choose the *Epanagoge* as an official handbook of law, for he saw in its definition a dangerous possibility of further reduction of imperial influence in Church affairs, and, in making his choice, he may have had the support of some ecclesiastical dignitaries who, too, were not favorably disposed toward a further increase of patriarchal rights.

It is also interesting to find that there is no mention of the other four patriarchs in the introduction to the *Epanagoge*. The Roman, as well as the three eastern patriarchs, are ignored. This is far removed from Justinian's attitude, and illustrates the fact that the Byzantines were becoming accustomed to the restriction of their political and religious interests to lands under the direct rule of the emperor. This proposed new law handbook lacks the universal outlook, so obvious in Justinian's legislative work. It was intended only for Greek-speaking subjects of the Empire.

Here again it would be an exaggeration to see in this the negation of the new pentarchic theory or an attempt to promote the patriarch of Constantinople to the head of the whole Church, at the expense of the see of Rome. This document must be studied in connection with other events that occurred in Byzantium during the ninth century, and in the light of other documentary evidence on the relations between Rome and Constantinople at that period.

In spite of the spread of the new pentarchic theory and of the conception of Byzantium's apostolic character, one can quote numerous statements by Photius and by other responsible ninth-century Byzantine churchmen, stressing the supreme position of Peter as Prince of the Apostles,²⁸ and revealing their awareness of the significance, for the organization of the Church, of Christ's words reported by Matthew (18:16).

pp. 385-400) makes Photius' authorship of this document most probable. The author's evaluation of title three of the *Epanagoge* (pp. 399, 400) is, in general, justified.

²⁸ Cf. F. Dvornik, *The Photian Schism*, pp. 182 seq., and especially J. Jugie, *Theologia dogmatica christian. oriental.*, 1, pp. 119-128. Cf. also an interesting passage in the *Vita S. Euthymii iunioris* (ed. L. Petit in *Revue de l'Orient chrétien*, 8 [1903], p. 204) where Peter is called τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀρωγὸς καὶ θεμέλιον and Andrew πρωτόκλητος . . . ὡς τῆς ποίμνης ἐξάρχων.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

The new evolution in Byzantine thinking that appeared after the defeat of the iconoclasts, brought about with the help of Rome, provided unexpected support to Roman claims in yet another respect. Asbestas, Bishop of Syracuse, and his associates, when condemned by the Patriarch Ignatius, appealed to the Patriarch of Rome, thus recognizing *de facto* the canons of the Synod of Sardica which acknowledged the supreme position of Rome and established the right of appeal to the Pope as representing the ultimate authority in the Church. The Synod of 861 marked another considerable step forward. The Byzantine Church, in consenting to the judgment of its Patriarch by the legates of the Pope, recognized Rome as the supreme tribunal of the Church in disciplinary matters. Some declarations made during that Synod, and still preserved in the abridged Acts salvaged by Cardinal Deusdedit,²⁹ amount, indeed, to an official acceptance of the famous canon of the Synod of Sardica.

When we view this evolution in the perspective of history, we might assume it to have been a cause of rejoicing for the whole Church, especially for Rome; also, a tacit acceptance of Constantinople's "apostolicity" might seem to have been a worthwhile concession on the part of Rome. But Pope Nicholas I could not see it in this light, which is not surprising, for his own conception of the Roman primacy was much more advanced, and it was hard for him to content himself with the concessions offered by Byzantium, although they provided a gratifying acceptance of the basic claims of Roman primacy.

During the conflict between Nicholas and Photius over the succession to Ignatius, the Roman and Byzantine conceptions of primacy in the Church were tested. The passionate verdicts voiced in Rome at the Synod of 863 and at Constantinople at the Synod of 867 augured ill for the future of the Church.

But the principle of unity in the Church, represented by the five patriarchs, was so strongly implanted in the minds of Christians of both West and East that the conflict ended in mutual agreement. The fact that Photius himself offered his hand in reconciliation shows that the prominent position of Rome in the Church was fully

²⁹ Cf. *supra* pp. 238, 239.

ANDREW LEGEND IN EAST AND WEST

recognized in Byzantium at that period. The Synod of 879–880 gave renewed support to Roman claims, but the Byzantine Church made it clear that it accepted only the basic principles of the primacy, and spiritedly defended its own administrative autonomy.

It appeared as if the pentarchic principle offered a basis for a satisfactory *modus vivendi* between Rome and Constantinople. The new principle must also have found followers in Rome, as can be gathered from the preface of Anastasius the Librarian to his translation of the Acts of the Ignatian Council. He defines the Roman conception of the pentarchy as follows:³⁰ "Because Christ has placed in His Body, which is the Church, the same number of patriarchal sees as there are senses in any mortal body, nothing will be lacking in the general welfare of the Church if all those sees are of one will, as nothing is lacking in the function of the body when all the five senses remain whole and healthy. Because the Roman see is naturally pre-eminent among them, it is compared, quite reasonably, to sight, which is the first among all the senses, is more vigilant than [the others] and is in communion with all of them to a greater degree than they are with each other."

Anastasius' words are the more significant for his being a faithful follower of Nicholas I, and for his sharing in every respect Nicholas' high conception of the primacy of the Roman see in the Church. This explains why, in the same preface, Anastasius rebukes the Byzantines for having tried to promote their see above the other eastern sees at the Second and Fourth Oecumenical Councils.³¹ In spite of this, the important position of Constantinople in the pentarchy is, at least tacitly, acknowledged.

Anastasius' testimony does not, apparently, stand alone. Other examples may be quoted to show that some progress toward a final understanding between the Churches on the basis of the pentarchic patriarchal authority in the Church was made in Rome in the ninth and tenth centuries. The conciliatory spirit which characterizes the reign of John VIII seems reflected in the collection of Canon Law called *Anselmo dedicata*, which quotes canon three of the Second Oecumenical Council and Justinian's novel 130, both granting to

³⁰ Mansi, 16, col. 7.

³¹ *Loc. cit.*, cols. 12E, 13A.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

the see of Constantinople second place in the patriarchal pentarchy. The same novel is also quoted in the *Collectio Vallicelliana* composed between 912 and 930, and in the *Collection of Nine Books*, also dating from the tenth century.³² This is particularly remarkable because these collections also quote the Damasian order of apostolic sees according to the Petrine principle.³³ All of this reveals the confusion created in many western minds, on the one hand, by the Pope's continuous emphasis of the Petrine principle and, on the other, by the endeavor, apparent in western thinking, to adapt itself to the existing situation.

During the tenth century there seems to have been hardly any recourse to the argument of apostolicity, either by Rome or by Constantinople. Nevertheless, the history of the tetragamy conflict provoked by the fourth marriage of Leo VI shows that the right of appeal to the Roman see in disciplinary matters continued to be recognized in principle. Actually the Emperor's appeal to Rome, when the Patriarch Nicholas Mysticus refused to allow this marriage, must be interpreted in this light, although it was ignored by the Patriarch and his followers. The request of the Emperor Romanus I Lecapenus for Roman confirmation of the election of his son Theophylactus to patriarchal dignity was a feeble reflection of a principle which had been more readily recognized by the Byzantines in the ninth century.

The Andrew Legend appears then to have been either unknown or disregarded in the West, though when Liutprand of Cremona visited Constantinople in 968 as the ambassador of Otto II, he must have learned something about it. However, he mentions Andrew only once in his angry report on the embassy.³⁴ Upon his return from Constantinople he expressed his regret at not having been able to

³² For details and bibliography see F. Dvornik, *op. cit.*, pp. 284 seq., 289 seq.

³³ The *Collectio Anselmo dedicata* quotes (bk. 10, chap. 108) Damasus' declaration on the Petrine sees, and the *Vallicelliana* (chap. 378) the *Decretum Gelasianum*. Cf. A. Michel, "Der Kampf um das politische oder petrinische Prinzip der Kirchenführung," *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, 2, ed. by H. Grillmeier, H. Bacht (Würzburg, 1953), pp. 522-524.

³⁴ *Legatio*, chap. 60, *MGH*, Ss. 3, p. 361; F. A. Wright, *The Works of Liutprand of Cremona* (London, 1930), p. 272.

ANDREW LEGEND IN EAST AND WEST

stop at Patras on his way back to Rome to venerate the scene of the Apostle's martyrdom, as he had done on his outward journey.

The prestige and self-confidence of the Byzantine Church must have grown considerably during the apparent decadence of the Roman papacy, and when the Ottos had restored order in Roman affairs, the relations between Rome and Constantinople took quite a different turn. The Byzantines did not object in principle to the role which the Roman aristocracy, often pro-Byzantine, played in the elections of popes, but they strongly objected to the appointment of the popes by German rulers who had usurped the title of Roman emperors.³⁵

It could have been expected that the Reformists, who had taken the government of the Church into their own hands under Leo IX, would return to the old Petrine principle, but the controversy shifted to other points of disagreement and Byzantium now took the offensive, attacking different Western usages in liturgy and discipline. Cardinal Humbert, the most prominent Latin protagonist, was kept very busy countering these attacks, but the questionable apostolic character of the see of Constantinople and its rank in the Church hierarchy were not overlooked by him.

It is, therefore, hardly surprising that a strong echo of the old Petrine thesis should have arisen in the correspondence of Leo IX with the East, which was directed by Humbert. The Antiochene see, having been founded by St. Peter, is hailed as the third in the Church hierarchy in the papal answer³⁶ to the *intronistica* sent to Rome by the Patriarch Peter of Antioch. The latter is exhorted by the Cardinal to defend valiantly the rights confirmed to his see by the Councils, against the actions of those who were anxious to rob Antioch of its privileges—a clear allusion to the Patriarch of Constantinople.

A reproach for similar affronts to Antioch is made by the Cardinal in the letter that he drafted, in the name of the Pope, to Michael

³⁵ See F. Dvornik, "Constantinople and Rome," to appear in *Cambridge Medieval History*, 4. Cf. V. Grumel, "Les préliminaires du schisme de Michel Cérulaire ou la question romaine avant 1054," *Revue des études byzantines*, 10 (1953), pp. 5-23.

³⁶ *PL*, 143, cols. 770B-D; Ed. A. Michel, *Humbert und Kerularios*, 2 (Paderborn, 1924-1930), p. 460.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

Cerularius.³⁷ Because of his attempts to subjugate Alexandria and Antioch, Michael is accused of disrupting the divine plan according to which the Church was built upon three pillars, i.e. the three Petrine patriarchates: Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch. The papal letter to Emperor Constantine IX Monomachus repeats the accusations made against the Patriarch of Constantinople.³⁸ When writing these missives Humbert forgets or overlooks the whole historical background of this controversy, making it appear that Michael was the first to try to supersede Alexandria and Antioch.

In the long letter to Michael Caerularius, which was not sent to the Patriarch, but was published in Constantinople as a pamphlet, Humbert states that, by the *Donatio Constantini*, Constantine the Great had elevated Rome above the other four patriarchs, all of whom are named; Constantinople being, of course, listed last of the five sees. The following passage³⁹ in the same document is, therefore, especially surprising: "Although the Church of Constantinople is by no divine or human privilege more honorable or glorious than other Churches, and [although] the Churches of Antioch and of Alexandria are in possession of special rights of dignity owing to the reverent respect [due] to the first of the apostles, nevertheless the pious mother, that is the Roman Church, anxious not to see her beloved daughter deprived of all dowry of honor, took care through the intermediary of some of our holy predecessors that in some synods it should be decided that, provided the old dignity of the principal and apostolic sees be fully respected, the archbishop of Constantinople should be honored as the bishop of the Imperial City, although Justinian, the pious Augustus, wished to determine by human laws that the bishop of Constantinople be seated after the pope of Rome. And indeed it [Constantinople] has obtained this through no prerogative of merit, but only because the Church of Rome, for love of the venerable Constantine, who had revered it and exalted it as highly [and as often] as he could through human benevolence alone, desired to distinguish his city by this privilege of honor."

³⁷ *Epist.* 2, *ad Michaelem Caerul.*, *PL*, 143, col. 774A,B.

³⁸ *PL*, 143, col. 780B.

³⁹ *PL*, 143, chap. 28, col. 763.

ANDREW LEGEND IN EAST AND WEST

This is a very curious statement, difficult to reconcile with historical facts. Yet it shows that, despite past events, certain progress had been made in the West toward acknowledging the prominent position of Constantinople in the patriarchal pentarchy.⁴⁰ The statement is particularly interesting because Humbert usually avoided giving the bishop of Constantinople the title of "patriarch," contenting himself with the epithet *regiae civitatis episcopus*, or *Constantinopolitanus archiepiscopus*.⁴¹

Dominicus of Grado also recalled the old Petrine tradition in his letter to Peter of Antioch,⁴² and the same ideas are echoed in a sermon⁴³ of Peter Damian, who became Cardinal of Ostia in 1057. Praising St. Mark, Peter attributes second place in the Church hierarchy to Alexandria, not so much because its see was founded by Mark, but because of Peter whose disciple Mark was. Antioch is allotted third place, Constantinople fourth, and Jerusalem fifth.

Peter Damian also wrote two sermons in honor of the Apostle Andrew. He regards Andrew as second in the apostolic choir, and praises the zeal with which he communicated to his brother Peter the good news that he had found the Messiah. Both had relinquished all worldly goods, but now "they hold the government of the whole world."⁴⁴ After their call to Christ, they did not show more familiarity to each other than to other apostles; they were not allotted the same provinces for preaching and, what is more important, "Andrew, who was first in faith, was not offended when he was allotted second place in dignity. He was not jealous of the fact that Peter, who was second in believing under his leadership, had

⁴⁰ Humbert is most probably influenced here by the Italian collections of Canon Law which, as mentioned *supra* p. 278, quoted Justinian's Novel concerning the status of the see of Constantinople. Cf. A. Michel, "Schisma und Kaiserhof im Jahre 1054. Michael Psellus," in *L'Eglise et les Eglises, 1054-1954*, 1 (Chevetogne, 1954), p. 391.

⁴¹ This had already been pointed out by A. Michel, *Humbert und Kerularios*, 1, pp. 49, 58, 92. Cf. especially how Humbert in his bull of excommunication calls Cerularius: *abusive dictum patriarcham, abusivus patriarcha*, PL, 143, cols. 1003A, 1004B.

⁴² PG, 120, col. 752A,B.

⁴³ Petrus Damianus, *Sermo XIV*, PL, 144, col. 575B.

⁴⁴ *Sermo LVII*, PL, 144, cols. 823B,C, 827B: *et quos in terra positos ipsa terrenarum rerum copia destituerat, nunc et totius orbis monarchiam tenent et in illa coelesti Hierusalem iustitiae potestatis soliis praesident.*

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

obtained the primacy over all apostles, although he [Andrew] had preceded him in believing."⁴⁵

Damian's words do not disclose whether he knew anything about the Constantinopolitan tradition concerning Andrew. In his second sermon he speaks only in general terms of Andrew's passion, assuming that his life and martyrdom are well known to everybody.⁴⁶ If he had read the work by Gregory of Tours, he must have found Byzantium mentioned as one of the cities visited by Andrew. Should his insistence on Andrew's submission to Peter be taken as an indication that he knew about Constantinople's claims and that he tried to answer them by emphasizing Andrew's subordination to Peter?

It is known that St. Peter Damian was one of the most gentle and restrained of the Reformists, while Humbert and Gregory VII were the most passionate of zealots. Damian had also shown more restraint than Humbert concerning the rank of Constantinople in the Church hierarchy, but Pope Gregory VII surpassed even the vehemence of Cardinal Humbert. In his letter to the Venetians appealing for help for the Patriarch of Grado,⁴⁷ Gregory showed particular disregard for Eastern tradition, by attributing the patriarchal title to only four sees; these being, evidently, Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Grado. The latter is praised as the most important in the West after Rome. The Petrine principle as echoed here, apparently included Grado. In only one instance did Gregory mention Antioch as a Petrine foundation.⁴⁸

In spite of the negative attitude on the part of Gregory VII, all the Reformists who gathered around him were not disrespectful of the position occupied in the Church by the see of Constantinople. One of the first canonists of the Gregorian reform, Anselm of Lucca, included in his collection of Canon Law the Petrine thesis

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, col. 828B.

⁴⁶ *Sermo LVIII*, *ibid.*, col. 830A: *Vocatio ejus, vita et passio cognita sunt vobis, et nunc, quid superest ut a me amplius expectetis?*

⁴⁷ Gregorius VII, *Registrum*, *Epist.* 2, 39; ed. E. Caspar, *Das Register Gregors VII*, p. 175 (*MGH, Epistolae selectae* [Berlin, 1920]).

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, *Epist.* 9, 18 (from 1081), ed. E. Caspar, p. 599. A. Michel is right in stating that Gregory VII was here following Gregory the Great ("Prinzip der Kirchenführung," *op. cit.*, p. 521).

ANDREW LEGEND IN EAST AND WEST

contained in the Decree of Damasus.⁴⁹ In spite of this, however, he also copied canon twenty-one of the Council of 869–870,⁵⁰ which has been shown to be permeated with the pentarchic idea, and which enumerates the patriarchs “in the Greek fashion.” Cardinal Deusdedit copied only the Decree of Damasus,⁵¹ leaving out canon twenty-one, but attributing to Constantinople fourth rank in the Church hierarchy.⁵² Curiously enough, canon twenty-one was copied from Anselm’s collection by Gratian, whose *Decretum*, composed about the year 1150, had superseded all other collections of Canon Law, and had become the official Canon Law handbook of the Middle Ages.

Gratian’s attitude toward this problem is rather interesting. In his twenty-second distinction⁵³ he quoted the main documents concerning Constantinople, which he found in other collections. In chapter one he copied a passage from the letter of Pope Nicholas II to the citizens of Milan, stressing the divine and Petrine origin of the Roman primacy. In chapter two he transcribed from Anselm’s collection the passage, here falsely attributed to Anacletus, emphasizing the Roman primacy and attributing second rank to Alexandria and third to Antioch. Gratian accompanied this canon with the following remark: “Through this authority the Church of Alexandria is regarded as having the second place after the first. But later, at the Council of Constantinople, the Church of Constantinople obtained the second place after the apostolic see. The same Synod, therefore, arrived at the following decision [canon three]: Constantinople gains second place after the apostolic see. Because the city of Constantinople is the New Rome, its bishop must possess the honor of primacy after the bishop of Rome.”

The next two canons of the same distinction emphasize the subordination of the see of Constantinople to the apostolic see.

⁴⁹ Anselmus Lucensis, *Collectio canonum*, 1, canon 66, ed. F. Thaner (Innsbruck, 1906), p. 34. Here falsely attributed to Anacletus.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 2, canon 72, ed. F. Thaner, pp. 109, 110.

⁵¹ Also attributed to Anacletus. Ed. V. Wolf von Glanvell, *Die Kanonesammlung des Kardinals Deusdedit* (Paderborn, 1905), bk. 1, canon 61, p. 63.

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 6 (*Prologus*), ed. V. W. von Glanvell, bk. 1, canon 250, p. 144; Deusdedit quotes here from the *Liber Pontificalis*, the confirmation of the Roman primacy by Phocas to Boniface III: *quia ecclesia Constantinopolitana primam se omnium ecclesiarum scribebat*.

⁵³ *Decretum Magistri Gratiani*, ed. E. Friedberg, 1 (Leipzig, 1879), pp. 72–76.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

Canon six, however, quotes the decision of the *Quinisexta Synodus* (692), confirming to the see of Constantinople the privileges of the Roman see and its precedence before Alexandria and Antioch. Gratian comments on this canon as follows: "It must be understood from this that the Church of Alexandria was made the third see from the second, and that of Antioch the fourth from the third, unless one wishes to assume that there are two second sees, thereby attributing to both Constantinople and Alexandria positions of equal dignity." Then Gratian quotes the part of the twenty-first canon of the Ignatian Council (869-870) forbidding offenses against the patriarchs, "first the most holy pope of Old Rome, then the patriarch of Constantinople, then of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem."

Gratian's attitude is very significant and illustrates the confusion on this point that prevailed in the minds of medieval canonists. His benevolent attitude toward the position of Constantinople in the Church probably influenced the further evolution of the attitude of the Western Church toward the see of Constantinople.

Gratian's influence can be noted first of all in the *Summa Decretorum*, published about 1157-1159 by the Magister Rufinus.⁵⁴ The patriarchal sees are enumerated "according to the old institutions" in the Petrine tradition—Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch. But Rufinus continues: "Because, however, in the course of time the imperial throne was transplanted from Rome to Constantinople, the Church of Constantinople was assigned the second see, Alexandria the third, and Antioch the fourth." Jerusalem is omitted.

Yet Rufinus knew well that there were five patriarchal sees, and he enumerated them all in his allocution to the Third Council of the Lateran in 1179.⁵⁵ His allocution, moreover, forcefully reflects the pentarchic idea. When interpreting Isaiah's words on the five cities in Egypt (Isa. 19:18), Rufinus says that, instead of the old five cities, the Lord "ordained that new cities, which are the Churches,

⁵⁴ *Summa Decretorum, Distinctio XXII*, ed. H. Singer (Paderborn, 1902), pp. 47-49.

⁵⁵ D. Germain Morin, "Le discours d'ouverture du Concile général du Latran (1179) et l'oeuvre littéraire de Maître Rufin, évêque d'Assise," *Atti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia*, 3rd ser., *Memorie*, 2 (Rome, 1928), pp. 113-133. The passage quoted is on p. 117.

ANDREW LEGEND IN EAST AND WEST

should be built by the apostolic architects." Of these five were given preference as five royal cities which were granted major privileges and could claim for themselves primacy of honor among other Churches, "such as the metropolitan see of Antioch, that of Alexandria, also Byzantium, and even that of Jerusalem; much more however, the one which should always be praised with most exalted words, that is the most holy Church of Rome, which, because she is the head of all sees, because she is the mother of all churches and also the teacher of all, has deserved most worthily to obtain, herself alone, the primacy among all Churches."

It must be noted that in this oratorical passage Rufinus does not follow the usual order in enumerating the five patriarchal sees. In another passage the orator calls Pope Alexander III *summus patriarcha*⁵⁶—a title which he also gives to the Pope in his *Summa*⁵⁷—and stresses that, while "all other patriarchal sees had been confirmed by human authority," the Roman Church owes its supreme position, not to synodal decrees or human ordinances—an echo of the Gelasian Decree—but to the will of the Lord himself, who had built His Church on Peter (Matt. 16:18).

It is certainly interesting to find such clear evidence of the pentarchic theory in a twelfth-century Latin sermon, especially since this sermon was addressed to the general assembly of the Roman Church, and it is remarkable that Constantinople was still counted among the five sees in spite of the break between Byzantium and Rome. Perhaps the hopes, albeit vain, aroused in Rome by the negotiations of Alexander III with Manuel I Comnenus in 1160/61 and 1161/62 had somewhat softened the Roman attitude toward Constantinople.

In the East the pentarchic idea was still very much alive in the eleventh century. This is particularly apparent in the letter of Peter, Patriarch of Antioch, to Dominicus of Aquileia who also had laid claim to the patriarchal dignity. Peter refuses to yield to his correspondent, arguing that there are only five patriarchs in the Church, as there are only five senses in the human body—a favorite

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 118.

⁵⁷ See the evidence quoted by D. G. Morin, *ibid.*, p. 126.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

simile of the pentarchic theory.⁵⁸ In his enumeration of the patriarchal sees, Peter places Constantinople second after Rome, although Dominicus, in the spirit of the Petrine tradition, had allotted third place to Antioch, after Rome and Alexandria.⁵⁹ Peter however gives to the bishops of Rome and Alexandria the title of papas, and to the titularies of Constantinople and Jerusalem that of archbishop, stressing that the title of patriarch had always been a special distinction of the bishop of Antioch. But elsewhere he gives the title of patriarch to the bishops of all the five sees.

The question of the apostolic character of the Byzantine see was not even touched on in the first polemical writings of Nicetas Pectoratus, nor in Humbert's reply.⁶⁰ Anselm of Havelberg, who, in 1135 held a discussion in Constantinople with Nicetas of Nicomedia, used the old Petrine argument for the prominence in the Church of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch,⁶¹ while his opponent invoked on his side the "imperial" argument for the prominence of Constantinople.⁶² Anselm pointed out, however, that Leo I did not accept the Chalcedonian decision concerning the status of Constantinople in the Church.⁶³ The question of apostolicity did not arise at all in the discussion, and the Apostle Andrew was mentioned only *en passant*, with the Apostles John and James.⁶⁴

The apostolic character of Constantinople was stressed in the letter written by Basil of Achrida to Pope Hadrian IV (1154-1159),⁶⁵ but the Pope's reactions to this claim are not known. In any case the main subjects of discussion here, too, were the differences in liturgical practice and the *Filioque*.

It is surprising that Theophanes Cerameus, a twelfth-century

⁵⁸ PG, 120, col. 757C, 760A.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, col. 752.

⁶⁰ PG, 120, cols. 1011 seq., 1021 seq.

⁶¹ Anselmus Havelbergensis, *Dialogus*, PL, 188, bk. 3, col. 1214.

⁶² *Ibid.*, col. 1218.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, col. 1221.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, col. 1222B: *Nam et Dominus Jesus non Andreae, non Ioannis, non Jacobi, nec alicujus alterius, sed solius Petri naviculam ascendit.*

⁶⁵ PG, 119, col. 932. On the other hand, it is striking to note that the Patriarch Symeon of Jerusalem had been given the title of "apostolicus" in the letter sent by the high clergy from Jerusalem to the Pope in 1098; a letter drafted undoubtedly by the legate Adhemar himself. See H. Hagemayer, *Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088-1100. Eine Quellensammlung zur Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzuges* (Innsbruck, 1901), p. 148 (letter 9).

ANDREW LEGEND IN EAST AND WEST

author who wrote a homily in honor of St. Andrew, did not mention the Apostle's activity in Byzantium, especially inasmuch as he was apparently well acquainted with the story of Andrew's travels, having mentioned in his homily both Sinope and Achaea.⁶⁶ He probably used as his source Andrew's biographies of the ninth century, or the writings of Metaphrastes. On the other hand, in the work of Nilus Doxopatres, of the same period, there are references of greater interest. In his description of patriarchal thrones, addressed in 1143 to Roger, King of Sicily, he uses the "imperial" argument for the prominent status of Constantinople.⁶⁷ Rome, he points out, lost its primacy when it fell to barbarians, and its pre-eminent position then passed to Constantinople: "As the Roman patriarch had the privilege of judging appeals from other patriarchs and examining accusations, so also may the Constantinopolitan, who received the privileges of Rome, pass sentence over the three patriarchs mentioned above."

Here Nilus means the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, and it is thus that he explains canon twenty-eight of the Council of Chalcedon. It should be noted that he limits the use of the privileges of the see of Constantinople to the East, giving the impression that he did not dare extend Constantinople's primacy over Rome. This feeling of caution is apparent also in another passage of the same work⁶⁸ where Nilus affirms that both patriarchs—the Roman and the Constantinopolitan—"are justly called oecumenical."

The see of Constantinople is said by Nilus to have been founded by Andrew, the first-called, who instituted there its first bishop, when the city was still called Byzantium.⁶⁹ Nilus is also, of course, a firm believer in the pentarchy which according to him was instituted by the Holy Ghost.⁷⁰ He employs here the well-known parallel of the five senses in the human body, but declares that "it is impossible to say today which senses the various patriarchates represent." Thus he avoids the comparison, used by the Latins, that

⁶⁶ PG, 132, cols. 904D, 905A. Cf. eloquent passages on Peter's pre-eminence in Cerameus' homilies (*ibid.*, cols. 465, 705, 964 seq., 1028).

⁶⁷ PG, 132, col. 1100.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, col. 1101C.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, col. 1105B.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, col. 1097C.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

the Roman patriarchate should be compared with the sense of vision, the most important of the five senses. The same comparison is also used by Nicetas Seides, who, however, attributes the function of vision to the patriarchate of Jerusalem, because it was the city chosen to see the Lord.⁷¹

The Petrine argument is turned against Rome also by the Patriarch Michael III of Anchialus (1170–1177) in his dialogue with the Emperor Manuel Comnenus on the union with the Latins. There he repeats Nilus' theory of the transfer of the primacy from Rome to Constantinople. He says the primacy's origin cannot be derived from Christ or from Peter, but only from imperial, and therefore human, decrees; the bishop of Rome is not pre-eminent because of Peter or Paul, as the Latins contend, for Peter was the teacher more of the whole world than merely of Rome; on the other hand, such an argument would attribute the primacy to Antioch rather than to Rome; furthermore, the honor would go to the bishop of Jerusalem, because Christ had lived there.⁷² Michael's argument concerning Peter as universal teacher was to be developed by later Greek polemicists.

The Greek thesis that the primacy of Rome in the Church was not of divine, but of human, origin was considerably strengthened by the *Donatio Constantini* which the Latins, beginning with the time of Humbert, used constantly in their polemics, and which at least from the twelfth century on, was regarded as genuine by the Greeks also.⁷³ Michael probably had this pseudo-document in mind when he affirmed the Roman primacy to have been established by imperial decrees, and his contemporary, Andronicus Camaterus, may also have had this in mind when he conceded to the Latins their right to a kind of primacy on the strength of some imperial

⁷¹ See quotation from Seidas' unpublished work in M. Jugie, *Theologia dogmatica*, 4, p. 455.

⁷² *Dialogus patriarchae et imperatoris*, ed. Ch. Loparev in *Vizantijskij Vremennik*, 14 (1907), pp. 344–357.

⁷³ It is possible that the Greeks knew much earlier a slightly different version of the pseudo-document. This version seems to have been used in the discussion between the Greeks and Liutprand of Cremona (*Legatio*, chap. 51, *MGH Ss.*, 3, p. 202). See, on this problem, the remarks made by F. Dölger ("Rom in der Gedankenwelt der Byzantiner," *Byzanz und die europ. Staatenwelt*, pp. 108–110) which, so far, are the most informative we have on the use of the *Donatio* by the Greeks.

ANDREW LEGEND IN EAST AND WEST

documents and old tradition. Andronicus in his "Holy Armory," published between the years 1170 and 1176, describes a discussion which the Emperor Manuel Comnenus is said to have had with Roman cardinals. As has already been pointed out by Hergenröther in his short résumé of this unpublished work,⁷⁴ the Emperor's arguments were those used by the Patriarch Michael III Anchialus against the Roman primacy: Since Peter was the teacher of the whole Church, it is an affront to him to limit his activities to Rome alone as do the Latins. The Petrine tradition, too, is directed against Rome by the Emperor, who points out that prior to his stay there Peter had taught in Antioch, and, in addition, the "imperial argument" is mentioned as further justification of Constantinople's position in the Church.

The Greek canonists of the twelfth century—Aristenus, Zonaras, and Balsamon—also believed in the authenticity of the *Donatio Constantini*. Aristenus interpreted the third canon of the Council of Constantinople and canon twenty-eight of Chalcedon as though they had already brought about the transfer of the primacy from Rome to Constantinople.⁷⁵ The other two canonists accorded greater respect to historical facts, granting to the patriarchate of Constantinople first rank after Rome,⁷⁶ but attributing the origin of this primacy to conciliar and imperial decrees, and claiming that the above-mentioned canons confirmed to Constantinople the same privileges enjoyed by Rome. Of course, on becoming a heretic, the Pope had lost all the privileges of his primacy.⁷⁷

These facts lead to the conclusion that during the first phase of the controversy between Rome and Constantinople, the idea of apostolicity and the Andrew Legend played almost insignificant roles. A new phase started however with the conquest of Constantinople by the Latins in 1204. A considerable change is noted first of all in the attitude of the Patriarch Camaterus. In his

⁷⁴ Hergenröther, *Photius*, 3, p. 813. An examination of the *Codex Monacensis* 229 (thirteenth century) by the present author showed that the Andrew argument was not used by the Emperor.

⁷⁵ Theodorus Balsamon, Zonaras, Aristenus, *In Canones SS. Apostolorum, Conciliorum... commentaria*, PG, 137, col. 325D.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, cols. 321C, 325, 485-489.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, cols. 321-324, 485-492, 1433-1444.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

letter to Innocent III, Camaterus⁷⁸ continued to profess the doctrine of the pentarchy, but denied to Rome any superiority over the others, insisting on their equality in everything. He seems also to have had in mind the apostolic foundation of Constantinople when he said: "many other Churches can contend with Rome over its primacy; those that were founded by different apostles and those that were evangelized by Peter.... There are five great Churches adorned with the patriarchal dignity; the Roman Church is the first among its sisters, equal in honor."

The Andrew argument was used for the first time with all its implications in an anti-Latin polemic by Nicholas Mesarites. In a disputation that took place August 30, 1206, in the presence of the Latin Patriarch of Constantinople, Thomas Morosini,⁷⁹ Mesarites first turned the old Roman Petrine tradition against Rome, proclaiming that Antioch had the better right to primacy because Peter had taught there eight years before he went to Rome. He spoke of Jerusalem too as deserving priority even over Rome, because Christ taught and died within its walls. Then he continues: "If Rome claims primacy because of Peter, then Byzantium possesses primacy because of Andrew, the first called and [Peter's] older brother by birth; [also] because it was built five hundred years before Rome." Furthermore, resuming the practice which had been in use in the East in earlier periods, Mesarites denies that Peter was Bishop of Rome. He came to Rome, says Mesarites, in his capacity of universal teacher, but the first Bishop of Rome was Linus, who was elected by the whole apostolic choir. Finally, to weaken further the Roman apostolic argument, Mesarites asserts that the Roman primacy had its origin in the imperial decree of Valerian dealing with the case of Paul of Samosata.

A similar argument against the Roman primacy is used also by Mesarites' brother John, who argued before Cardinal Benedict on September 29th of the same year,⁸⁰ claiming that the apostles

⁷⁸ See the *Codex Parisinus Graecus*, 1302 (thirteenth century, on paper, not very legible, fols. 270^v–273^v). Cf. M. Jugie, *op. cit.*, 4, pp. 341, 386.

⁷⁹ Published by A. Heisenberg. "Neue Quellen zur Geschichte des lateinischen Kaisertums und der Kirchenunion," in *Sitzungsberichte der Bayrischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse*, 2 (1923), pp. 22–24.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 1, pp. 54 seq.

ANDREW LEGEND IN EAST AND WEST

performed oecumenical missions and were not bishops of particular cities, and that the seventy disciples were, on the other hand, assigned to different sees by the apostles. It is interesting to find here the legendary tradition of the seventy disciples inspired by the lists of apostles and disciples.

Of course such arguments did not allow the brothers to exploit the Andrew tradition to the full for the profit of Constantinople. In fact, John admitted that the pope could act as supreme judge in the event of an appeal from a patriarch condemned by a synod of his patriarchate.⁸¹ The pope, of course, could enjoy this prerogative only if he were of orthodox faith; the prerogative, however, was based not on a divine institution, but only on Canon Law. A similar opinion was voiced by John's brother, Nicholas, in a disputation that took place in 1214.⁸²

The pentarchic thesis is invoked also by the Patriarch Germanus II (about 1222-1240) in one of his letters to the Cypriotes. He recognizes only one primacy, that of Christ, and declares that the Romans, in trying to transfer this primacy from Christ to their Pope, thus placing the Pope's throne above the clouds and equating him with the Highest One,⁸³ were disrupting the pentarchy.

Germanus II seems also to have published some anti-Latin writings. In the Latin treatise against the Greeks composed by the Dominicans in Constantinople (1252),⁸⁴ and wrongly attributed to the deacon Pantaleemon, he is said, in one of his writings, to have called St. Paul "Coryphaeus of the Apostles." Although another Greek bishop had characterized such a designation of Paul as insupportable, the Latin polemicists tried to make capital of it for their own thesis, stating that the pope is rightly the successor of both Apostles. "He succeeded to Peter in the power of the keys, to Paul in the judgment of disputes, for as Peter obtained from the Lord the authority to bind and to absolve, so Paul obtained the plenitude of wisdom."⁸⁵

Of particular interest in this polemical treatise is its revelation of

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 1, p. 57.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 3, pp. 34 seq.

⁸³ *Epistula II ad Cyprios*, PG, 140, cols. 616C-617A.

⁸⁴ See F. Dvornik, *The Photian Schism*, p. 347.

⁸⁵ *Tractatus contra Graecos*, PG, 140, col. 528B.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

the Latin view of Constantinople's claims to apostolicity, even after the city's conquest by the crusaders. The polemist again take full advantage of the Petrine tradition: Antioch obtained its privileges because Peter had stayed there; Alexandria because he sent Mark to that city as his vicar. Even Caesarea of Palestine is mentioned among the patriarchates, because "Peter convoked a council there."⁸⁶ In addition to all this, Jerusalem, too, became the see of a patriarch because the First Oecumenical Council conferred this honor upon it, but here the polemist seem to telescope historical developments, arguing that this decision was made by the Council because the Centurion Cornelius was ordained bishop of that city by Peter and thus became the representative of the Apostle of the Apostles.⁸⁷

As for Constantinople, *proprie sedem non habet*. According to the polemist it was promoted to patriarchal rank by the Second Council and by the Fourth on the authority of the emperors, but Pope Leo protested against the promotion. Leo's letters are quoted, after which the polemist emphasizes, in accordance with his declaration, that the Church was divided into four parts: Rome, Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch.⁸⁸

The polemist turn against a thesis which they say is defended by some Latins, namely, that certain sees are termed patriarchal because the apostles had once occupied them. This is interesting because it suggests that some Latins attributed an apostolic character to Constantinople. If this interpretation is correct, it might be deduced that some Latins placed credence even in the Andrew Legend.⁸⁹

But the authors of the treatise object to such an interpretation, explaining that only those sees could be patriarchal wherein Peter had resided either in person or through his representatives. However, not all patriarchal sees can claim that the apostles had resided in them: "no apostle has resided in Constantinople or Alexandria, but only Peter's disciple St. Mark. But Barnabas, who was elected Apostle of the Gentiles, with the Blessed Paul, resided in Milan,

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, col. 528D.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, cols. 528D, 529A.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, cols. 529B-D, 530A-C.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, col. 530D: *Hic se sic habentibus, multum videtur oppositio quorundam Latinorum infirmari, quod dicunt, quod patriarchiae dictae sunt, quia in his locis apostoli praesederunt.*

ANDREW LEGEND IN EAST AND WEST

and some other Apostles and especially their disciples resided in other regions.”⁹⁰ If the above thesis had been valid there would have been more than five patriarchal sees. After quoting some other papal and patriarchal documents confirming the pope’s primacy, the polemist add, *verbatim*, their last trump card—the full text of the *Donatio Constantini*, insisting particularly on the service of a *strator* rendered, according to this forgery, by Constantine the Great to Sylvester I.⁹¹

The Apostle Andrew was introduced in an unusual way, by an anonymous Greek, into the polemics against the Latins.⁹² The polemist first denies to Rome primacy in teaching, since, Antioch, where Peter had taught first, had the better claim; he then argues that, although Rome based its primacy on Peter’s throne, other cities could make similar claims. Ephesus was founded by the Apostle John, whom Christ had loved most; nevertheless its bishop was subject to Constantinople. He cites also the case of Alexandria, and grants that even Patras, because St. Andrew had met his martyrdom there, could consider itself patriarchal.

Mesarites’ argument, based on the Andrew tradition, opposing the primacy of Rome was again fully exploited “against those who say that Rome is the first see” by the anonymous author of the pamphlet so often falsely attributed to the Patriarch Photius. It has, however, been shown that Photius could not have written such a treatise,⁹³ and that its author must have published his writing sometime during the first decades of the thirteenth century, availing himself of the arguments publicized by Mesarites.⁹⁴ The pamphlet is replete with the hatred and exasperation that must have dominated the minds of the Greeks after the Latin conquest of Constantinople.

It is important to note that chapter five of this opusculum echoes strongly the argument used by Mesarites and his brother against Roman primacy, that is, that the apostles were universal teachers and were not confined to special areas as local bishops. It states:

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, cols. 530D, 531A.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, cols. 531B–538A.

⁹² Published by the Metropolitan Arsenius, *Tri stat’i neizvestnago grečeskago pisatelja načala XIII veka* (Moscow, 1892).

⁹³ See *supra*, pp. 245–253.

⁹⁴ M. Gordillo, “Photius et primatus; Romanus,” *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, 6 (1940), pp. 23 seq. See *supra* p. 253 and *infra* p. 294.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

"If you come forward to me with the saying 'thou art Peter and on this rock I will build my Church' etc., you may know that this was not meant of the Roman Church, not in any respect. It is Jewish and very wrong to circumscribe Grace and its divine character within certain limits and localities, and to deny that it bestows its benefits equally throughout the universe. . . ." These words "were manifestly used of the rock of the confession proclaiming Christ's divinity and, through it, of the universal Church, extended and well-established through the doctrine of the apostles as far as the confines of the world."⁹⁵ This argument, here only alluded to, was generally used by the polemicists of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

Especial interest attaches to the consideration of the primacy by the monk Barlaam, before he joined the Union. He does not dispute Peter's primacy over the apostles, but denies that Peter had transferred this primacy to his successor in Rome. All apostles were ordained priests by Christ, obtaining from Him different *charismata*, and were instituted by Him as universal bishops. It could be argued that Peter had appointed a successor and heir to his primacy if the other apostles had left heirs and successors to their apostolates and *charismata*. There is, however, no successor in the apostolic institution. The bishops were ordained for different areas not by Christ, but by the apostles. They are all equal and none can claim jurisdiction over the whole world.⁹⁶ "If the Bishop of Rome alone had been ordained by the Apostle Peter, it might be supposed that he had left it [the primacy] to him. However, he ordained bishops in many other cities also. How, therefore, could this be considered evidence that he made the bishop of Rome master of the others and equal to himself?"⁹⁷

Moreover, the argument continues, Peter ordained his successor in Rome, but popes cannot ordain their own successors; they are,

⁹⁵ It is plausible to see in this tendency another indication that the opusculum could not have been written in the ninth century, for at that time such arguments against the primacy were not used. They were first used, as far as is known, by the Patriarch Michael III of Anchialus in the twelfth century. All of the chroniclers of the ninth century had accepted the Roman tradition that placed Peter at the head of the line of Roman bishops.

⁹⁶ Περὶ τῆς τοῦ πάπᾶ ἀρχῆς. *Codex Parisinus Graecus* 1218 (fifteenth century), fol. 522. Cf. M. Jugie, *op. cit.*, 4, p. 331.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, fol. 523B; M. Jugie, *loc. cit.*, p. 392.

ANDREW LEGEND IN EAST AND WEST

therefore, not equal to the coryphaeus. If the primacy of the Roman bishop were deduced from the fact that Peter had died in Rome, this distinction could be claimed by bishops of all cities in which the other apostles had died. Jerusalem's claim would be the most secure, for Christ died there. Barlaam concludes that the Roman bishop was the equal of other bishops, and that he owed his privileged place in the Church not to succession from Peter, but to the Emperors Constantine—a clear allusion to the *Donatio*—and Justinian and to the synods.⁹⁸

Barlaam repeats the same arguments in his address to a Latin,⁹⁹ which, despite many similarities, differs from the unpublished treatise. At the end of this address he recapitulates his arguments in nine short paragraphs, stressing the fact that the popes had never presided at a synod; that, on the contrary, the synods had determined the degree of honor and the rights enjoyed by the bishops of Rome.¹⁰⁰

Nilus Cabasilas, Metropolitan of Thessalonica, adopted all of Barlaam's arguments against the Roman primacy, stressing that Peter was "a teacher of the whole world," while the pope was only the bishop of Rome and successor of one of the bishops ordained in many areas by Peter.¹⁰¹ Matthew Angelus Panaretus¹⁰² and Macarius Ancyranus¹⁰³ followed their predecessors in their campaigns against the Latins, opposing the Roman primacy with similar arguments.

This of course does not mean that the Greeks of this period did not believe in the authenticity of the Andrew and Stachys Legend. As has already been pointed out, the Church historian Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos copied in his work—probably from Pseudo-Dorotheus' catalogue—the story of Andrew's missionary activity

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, fol. 524C.

⁹⁹ Barlaam, *Contra Latinos*, PG, 151, cols. 1255–1280.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, cols. 1276–1278.

¹⁰¹ *De primatu papae*, PG, 149, cols. 700–705. Cf. the refutation of Nilus' arguments by Matthew Caryphylus, *ibid.*, 736 seq.

¹⁰² Panaretus composed, among his numerous polemic treatises, three that refuted Roman claims to primacy. See the description of the manuscripts in which they are preserved and the resumé of Panaretus' arguments in P. Risso, "Matteo Angelo Panaretos e cinque suoi opuscoli," *Roma e l'Oriente*, 8 (1914), pp. 175, 176. Cf. also Panaretus' treatise against the azymes published by P. Risso (*ibid.*, 6 [1916]), p. 158.

¹⁰³ Κατὰ Ἀσίνων, ed. Dositheus, Τόμος ἀγάπης, pp. 5. seq. He appears to have been the first Greek who did not believe in the authenticity of the *Donatio Constantini* (*ibid.*, pp. 8–10).

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

in Thrace, Macedonia, and Byzantium, and of Stachys' ordination by him as Bishop of that city. After enumerating the bishops who had occupied the five major sees under Licinius and Constantine the Great, Nicephorus introduced the story as follows: "upon coming to this point it seems to me advisable to review the names of the bishops of Byzantium from the time of the apostles, and thus to add a kind of divine title to the historical account."¹⁰⁴ These words show clearly Nicephorus' pride in the apostolic origin of the Byzantine see. Another author of the same period, the chronographer Ephrem, added to his verse chronicle, written about the year 1313, a catalogue of Constantinopolitan bishops beginning with Andrew and Stachys and repeating the catalogue of Pseudo-Dorotheus.¹⁰⁵

It would be of little value to examine in detail the arguments of other Greek and Latin polemicists before and after the Council of Florence, for it has already been clearly shown that the new trend in Greek polemical literature, adopted in the twelfth century and fully developed in the two subsequent centuries, had greatly diminished the usefulness of both Byzantine apostolic origins and the Andrew Legend in Greek opposition to Roman primacy. Once the Greek polemicists adopted the old thesis that the apostles had been appointed by Christ as universal teachers rather than as bishops of particular cities, thereby admitting it impossible for them to have transmitted to others their universal mission, it was pointless to argue that the see of Constantinople was of apostolic origin, and that the Apostle Andrew had consecrated its first bishop, Stachys.

It is no wonder, then, that the Greeks began again to emphasize the imperial argument. The Latins unwittingly helped them considerably in this change of attitude. Not satisfied with the arguments taken from the Scriptures and the Petrine tradition—although these were their strongest points, and most embarrassing to their opponents—the Latins sought further to strengthen the position of Rome in the Church by an "imperial" argument, and often turned to the *Donatio Constantini* in their polemics. The Greeks fully accepted this false document at its face value, for it conformed to

¹⁰⁴ *Historia ecclesiastica*, PG, 146, col. 28C.

¹⁰⁵ Verses 9656 seq.; ed. Bonn, pp. 383 seq.; PG. 143, cols. 349C seq.

ANDREW LEGEND IN EAST AND WEST

their own ideas of the emperor's role in Church affairs,¹⁰⁶ and they used it as resourcefully as they could in countering the claims of Rome and furthering those of Constantinople.

There might have been yet another explanation of the change in Greek polemical tactics. After the conquest of Constantinople by the Latins, and the occupation of its see by a Latin prelate, there was no reason for Rome to deny to that see the second place in ecclesiastical hierarchy claimed by the Byzantines for so many centuries. So it happened that the Fourth Council of the Lateran, convoked by Innocent III in 1215, made the following definition in its fifth canon, approved by the Pope: "In renewing the old privileges of the patriarchal sees, we sanction, with the approbation of the holy Synod, that, after the Church of Rome, which by the disposition of the Lord has the principate of natural power over all others as mother and teacher of all Christian faithful, the see of Constantinople has the first rank, that of Alexandria the second, that of Antioch the third, and that of Jerusalem the fourth, provided each of them keeps its own honor."¹⁰⁷

It is true that this recognition was given for the benefit of a Latin patriarch, and that the subordination of all other patriarchs to Rome was duly stressed in the last part of the canon; nevertheless the long controversy over the rank of Constantinople was finally settled, and the Greeks must have learned of it. The Pope acted on his own authority in this instance, but the introductory words of the canon—"renewing the old privileges of the patriarchal sees"—could have been interpreted, at least by the Greeks, as referring to previous conciliar decisions concerning the rank of patriarchs.

The same concession was restated, this time for the benefit of the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople, at the Council of Florence

¹⁰⁶ This was well perceived by W. Ohnesorge in his study, "Die Konstantinische Schenkung, Leo III und die Anfänge der kurialen röm. Kaiseridee," *Zeitschrift der Savigny Stiftung, Germanistische Abteilung*, 68 (1951), p. 103. "...die Methode, die ganz im altrömisch-byzantinischen Staatsdenken wurzelt: Neuordnung der kirchlichen Gewalt—einschließlich der Vergebung der Patriarchate—durch den Kaiser. Die Grundtendenz des *Constitutum Constantini* ist also griechisch."

¹⁰⁷ Mansi, 22, cols. 990 seq., Gratian's words, in his *Decretum*, on the rank of the see of Constantinople certainly helped the Fathers to make this decision.

LEGEND OF THE APOSTLE ANDREW

(1439),¹⁰⁸ and another unexpected concession was made later. The fact that the Andrew Legend was so little exploited by the Greeks as an argument against the Roman primacy may have also contributed to the eventual acceptance by Rome of the Andrew and Stachys Legend. Unfortunately this occurred only at a very late period, when the acknowledgment of the apostolic character of the see of Constantinople was of little use for the rapprochement of the separated Churches, and it was brought about, strangely enough, by the very man who was most responsible for the misinterpretation of the Photian schism, and who thus placed another obstacle in the way of the Churches' reunion—Cardinal Baronius. He inserted into his edition of the Roman *Martyrologium* of 1586, under the date October 31st, the following notice: *Constantinopoli sancti Stachis episcopi, qui a beato Andrea Apostolo primus ejusdem civitatis episcopus ordinatus est.*¹⁰⁹

Completing the reversal of Roman opinion about Stachys, Baronius also accepted as a historical figure the legendary martyr Dorotheus, believed to have been the author of the list of Byzantine bishops that began with Stachys and ended with Metrophanes. The Cardinal's *Martyrologium* states, under the date of June 5th: *Tyri passio S. Dorothei presbyteri, qui sub Diocletiano multa passus est; et usque ad Juliani tempora superstes, sub eo annum agens septimum supra centesimum, venerandam senectam martyrio honestavit.* This is an unexpected end to a hotly disputed controversy. Even more puzzling, however, is the fact that the names of both Dorotheus and Stachys are still in the Roman *Martyrologium*, and the life stories of the two men are piously read and believed by many.

In reflecting on this change of attitude on the part of the West

¹⁰⁸ Mansi, 31A, cols. 1031 E, 1034: *Renovantes insuper ordinem traditum in canonibus caeterorum venerabilium patriarcharum, ut patriarcha Constantinopolitanus secundus sit post Romanum Pontificem, tertius vero Alexandrinus, quartus autem Antiochenus et quintus Hierosolymitanus, salvis videlicet privilegiis omnibus, et juribus eorum.*

¹⁰⁹ C. Baronius, *Martyrologium Romanum* (2nd ed., Antwerp, 1589), p. 481. Cf. N. Nilles, *Kalendarium manuale utriusque ecclesiae*, 1 (Innsbruck, 1896), p. 311. *Acta Sanctorum Octobris*, 13, p. 687. Baronius' *Martyrologium* is quoted by A. Du Saussay (*Andreas Frater Simonis Petri seu de gloria S. Andreae apostoli, libri XII* [Paris, 1656], pp. 155 seq.) as the main argument for the historicity of the Stachys Legend.

ANDREW LEGEND IN EAST AND WEST

toward Byzantine claims regarding the apostolic character of the see of Constantinople, it is a great temptation to conclude these considerations with the remark: *Difficile est saturam non scribere*. There is, however, nothing satirical in the history of this dispute. From beginning to end this argument over two principles of ecclesiastical organization—that of apostolicity and that of adaptation to the political organization of the Empire—was conducted earnestly and passionately. The lack of understanding of the first and the over-emphasizing of the second on the part of the Byzantines induced the Romans to deny to Constantinople that second rank in Church organization which it rightfully claimed. Similarly, Rome was prevented from recognizing early enough the change in Byzantium that favored the apostolic principle in Church organization. Thus it was that this dispute contributed so considerably toward intensifying the misunderstanding between West and East; a misunderstanding that, together with other factors, led to the schism so fateful for the history of Christianity.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>AnBoll</i>	<i>Analecta Bollandiana</i> , Société des Bollandistes, Brussels, 1882-.
<i>AS</i>	<i>Acta Sanctorum</i> , Société des Bollandistes, Brussels, 1863-.
<i>Bonn</i>	<i>Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae</i> , called the <i>Bonn Corpus</i> 1828-1897.
<i>BZ</i>	<i>Byzantische Zeitschrift</i> , Leipzig, 1892-.
<i>CSCO</i>	<i>Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium</i> , Catholic University of America and Université catholique, Louvain, 1952-.
<i>CSEL</i>	<i>Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum</i> , Academia litterarum caesarea, Vindobonensis, 1866-.
<i>GCS</i>	<i>Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte</i> , K. Preussische Akademie der Wiss., Leipzig, 1897-.
<i>Mansi</i>	<i>Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio</i> , ed. G. D. Mansi, 31 vols., Florence, Venice, 1759-1798.
<i>MGH</i>	<i>Monumenta Germaniae historica. Auct. ant., Auctores antiquissimi; Epist., Epistolae; Ss., Scriptores; Script. rer. Merov., Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum.</i>
<i>OCP</i>	<i>Orientalia Christiana periodica</i> , Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, Rome, 1935-.
<i>PG</i>	<i>Patrologiae cursus completus</i> , ed. J. P. Migne: <i>Patrologia Graeca</i> , 161 vols., Paris, 1844-1866.
<i>PL</i>	<i>Patrologiae cursus completus</i> , ed. J. P. Migne; <i>Patrologia Latina</i> , 221 vols., Paris, 1844-1864.
<i>Teubner</i>	<i>Bibliotheca Teubneriana</i> , Leipzig.

LIST OF MANUSCRIPTS QUOTED

- Acta S. Andreae et Matthiae. Codex Parisinus, supplementum graecum* 824, fols. 10^v, 9, 8, 7, 2, 5, 4, 3, 1^v (tenth century).
- Codex Parisinus graecus* 1539, fols. 285–305^v (eleventh century).
- ANDRONICUS CAMATERUS, Ἱερὰ ὄπλοθήκη (Holy Armory), *Codex Monacensis graecus* 222 (thirteenth century).
- BARLAAM. *De primatu papae. Codex Parisinus graecus* 1218, fols. 521^v–525 (fifteenth century).
- Catalogus Apostolorum et Discipulorum Domini. Codex Vaticanus graecus* 2001, fols. 78–80^v (twelfth century).
- Catalogus Apostolorum et Discipulorum Domini. Codex Vaticanus graecus* 1506, fols. 302^v–305 (thirteenth century).
- JOANNES CAMATERUS. *Litterae ad Innocentium III. Codex Parisinus graecus* 1302, fols. 270^v–275 (thirteenth century).
- Photii Epistolae. Codex graecus*. No. 2756 in the National Library of Greece in Athens, fols. 120^v–176^v (end of thirteenth, or beginning of fourteenth century).
- Synodicon Velus. Sinaiticus* 482 (= 1117), fols. 357^v–365.
- Vita S. Andreae Apostoli. Codex Parisinus graecus* 1313, fols. 110–172^v (fifteenth century).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES:

- Acta Andreae cum Laudatione contexta*, see M. Bonnet, *Supplementum*.
- Acta apostolorum apocrypha, sive historia certaminis apostolici adscripta Abdiae, Babyloniae episcopo. Codex apocryphus Novi Testamenti*, 2, ed. J. A. Fabricius (Hamburg, 1719), pp. 456-515.
- Acta apostolorum apocrypha*, 3 vols., ed. R. A. Lipsius, M. Bonnet (Leipzig, 1891-1903).
- Acta Concilii Chalcedonensis*, Mansi, 6, cols. 539-874.
- Acta Concilii Constantinopolitani primi*, Mansi, 3, cols. 521-600.
- Acta Concilii Ephesini*, Mansi, 4, cols. 567-1482; 5, cols. 1-420. Also ed. E. Schwartz, *Acta Conciliorum oecumenicorum*, t. 1, vol. 1, pts. 1-6. *Concilium universale Ephesinum, acta graeca, collectio Vaticana* (Berlin, Leipzig, 1927-29).
- Acta Concilii Ignatiani* (869-70), Mansi, 16, cols. 1-550.
- Acta Concilii oecumenici sexti*, Mansi, 11, cols. 922-1122.
- Acta Concilii Photiani* (879-80), Mansi, 17, cols. 371-529.
- Acta Pauli nach dem Papyrus der Hamburger Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek*, ed. C. Schmidt, W. Schubart (Hamburg-Glückstadt, 1936).
- Acta Synodi Sardicensis* (347), Mansi, 3, cols. 1-82.
- AENEAS EPISC. PARISENSIS, *Liber adversus Graecos*, *PL*, 121, cols. 681-762.
- AGAPIUS OF MENBIDJ. "Kitab al Unvan," trans. by A. A. Vasiliev, *Patrologia Orientalis*, 5, pp. 557-692; 7, pp. 459-591; 11, pp. 1-144.
- AGNELLUS. *Codex pontificalis ecclesiae Ravennatensis*, ed. A. Testi Raspo-
mini, L. A. Muratori, *Rerum italicarum scriptores*, 2, pt. 3 (new ed.,
Bologna, 1924).
- ALBERRY, C. R. C. *A Manichaean Psalm-book, Manichaean Manuscripts
in the Chester Beatty Collection*, 2 (Stuttgart, 1938), p. 142.
- AMBROSIUS, S. *Epistolae*, *PL*, 16, cols. 890-1371.
- Anonymus Graecus de Sancto Petro et Paulo*, *AS* (29 Junii), 3rd ed. 7,
pp. 374-386.
- ANSELMUS HAVELBERGENSIS. *Dialogus*, *PL*, 188, cols. 1139-1248.
- ANSELMUS LUCENSIS. *Collectio canonum*, ed. F. Thaner (Innsbruck, 1906).
- Apocrypha anecdota*, ed. M. R. James in *Texts and Studies* (ed. J. A.
Robinson), 2, no. 3; 5, no. 1 (Cambridge, 1893, 1897).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- The Apocryphal New Testament*, trans. by M. R. James (Oxford, 1924).
- ARISTOTLE. *Politics*, ed. H. Rackham, Loeb Classical Library (1932).
- ARNOBIUS. *Adversus nationes libri septem*, CSEL, 4, ed. A. Reifferscheid (1875).
- ARRIANUS. *Periplus Ponti Euxini*, *Geographi graeci minores* 2, ed. C. Müller (Paris, 1882) pp. 370-423.
- ARSENIUS, METROPOLITAN. *Tri stat'i neizvestnago grečeskago pisatelja načala XIII vėka* (Moscow, 1892).
- ARTEMIUS, S. *Passio*, PG, 96, cols. 1251-1320.
- ATHANASIUS, S. *Historia arianorum*, PG, 25, cols. 691-796.
- AUGUSTINUS HIPPONENSIS, S. *Contra Faustum Manichaeum libri XXXIII*, CSEL, 25, ed. J. Zycha (1891), pp. 249-797.
- *Contra Felicem libri II*, *ibid.* pp. 800-852.
- *De Unitate Ecclesiae (Ad Catholicos Epistula contra Donatistas)* PL, 43, cols. 391-446; CSEL, 52, ed. M. Petschenig (1909), pp. 231-322.
- *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, PL, 36, cols. 67-1028.
- *Epistolae*, PG, 33, 38; CSEL, 34, 57, ed. A. Goldbacher (1908-11).
- *Gesta collationis Carthagine habitae inter Catholicos et Donatistas*, Mansi, 4, cols. 1-286.
- *Sermones*, PL, 38.
- BARLAAM. *Contra Latinos*, PG, 151, cols. 1256-1280.
- Barsamya, Martyrdom of*. See *infra*, Doctrine of Apostle Addaeus.
- BASILIUŠ, EP. SELEUCIENSIS. *Encomium in Sanctum Andream*, PG, 28, cols. 1101-13 (printed with works of Athanasius).
- BASILIUŠ MAGNUS, S. *Epistolae*, PG, 32, cols. 219-1112; also ed. and trans. by R. J. Deferrari, Loeb Classical Library, 4 vols. (1926-34).
- BLASTARES, MATTHAEUS. *Syntagma canonum*, PG, 144, cols. 959-1400; 145, cols. 9-212.
- BONNET, M. *Supplementum codicis apocryphi* (Paris, 1895). *Acta Andreae cum laudatione contexta*, pp. 1-44; *Narratio (Martyrium S. Apostoli Andreae)*, pp. 45-64; *Passio S. Andreae apostoli*, pp. 65-70. All first published in *An Boll*, 13 (1894), pp. 309-378.
- CEDRENUS, GEORGIUS. *Historiarum compendium* (Bonn, 1839).
- Chronicon Paschale* (Bonn, 1832).
- Chronographeion syntomon*, ed. A. Schoene, *Eusebii chronicorum libri II*, 1 (Berlin, 1875), appendix 4, pp. 63-102.
- Chronographus anni 354*, MGH, *Auct. ant.* 9, ed. T. Mommsen, pp. 15-148.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- CLEMENS, PAPA ROMANUS, S. *Epistola ad Corinthios*, ed. J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 2 (London, 1890), Engl. trans. by F. X. Glimm, *The Apostolic Fathers* (New York, 1947).
- Codex Theodosianus*, ed. P. Krueger, Th. Mommsen (Berlin, 1905). Engl. trans. by C. Pharr (Princeton, 1952).
- Collectio Avellana*, CSEL, 35, ed. O. Günther (1895-98).
- Collectio canonum XIV titulorum*, ed. V. N. Benešević, *Kanoničeski sbornik XIV titulov so vtoroj četverti VII veka do 887 g.* (St. Petersburg, 1903).
- Collectio Thessalonicensis*, Mansi, 8, cols. 739 seq. (see also E. Schwartz, in *Secondary Authorities*); ed. C. von Silva-Tarouca in *Textus et Documenta, series theologica*, 23 (Rome, 1937).
- CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENITUS. *De administrando imperio* (Bonn, 1840); ed. G. Moravcsik, trans. by R. J. H. Jenkins (Budapest, 1949).
- Contendings of the Apostles* (Ethiopic Text), ed. and trans. by E. A. Wallis Budge, 2 vols. (London, 1901).
- Corpus Iuris Civilis*, ed. P. Krüger, Th. Mommsen, R. Schoell, G. Kroll, 3 vols.; *Codex Justinianus*, 2, *Novellae*, 3 (Berlin, 1928-29).
- CYPRIANUS CARTHAGIENSIS. *De Catholicae ecclesiae unitate*, CSEL, 3, ed. G. Hartel (1871), pp. 209-33.
- CYRILLUS HIEROSOLYMITANUS, S. *Catecheses*, PG, 33, cols. 331-1128.
- DAMASUS, PAPA, S. *Epistolae*, PL, 13, cols. 347-76.
 ——— *Carmina*, *ibid.*, cols. 376-414.
- DEUSDEDIT, CARDINALIS. *Collectio canonum*, ed. V. Wolf von Glanvell, *Die Kanonensammlung des Kardinals Deusdedit* (Paderborn, 1905).
- Didascalia et Constitutiones apostolorum*, 1, ed. F. X. Funk (Paderborn, 1905).
- Doctrina apostolorum syriaca*. See W. Cureton, in *Secondary Authorities*.
 "The Doctrine of the Apostle Addaeus; Martyrdom of Barsamya," ed. W. Cureton, *Ancient Syriac Documents* (London, 1864), pp. 6-23, 63-72.
- ENODIUS UZALENSIS. *De fide contra Manichaeos*, CSEL, 25, ed. J. Zycha (1891), pp. 951-75.
- Epanagoge*, ed. K. E. Zachariae von Lingenthal, reprinted in J. Zepos, P. Zepos, *Jus Graeco-romanum*, 2 (Athens, 1931).
- Epiphanii monachi et presbyteri edita et inedita*, ed. A. Dressel (Paris, Leipzig, 1843).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- EPIPHANIUS. *Vita S. Andreae*, PG, 120.
- EPIPHANIUS CYPRIENSIS. *Panarion haereticorum (Adversus Haereses)*, PG, 41, GCS, 25, ed. K. Holl (1915).
- Epistolae Romanorum pontificum*, ed. P. Coustant (Paris, 1721).
- Epistolae Romanorum pontificum genuinae*, ed. A. Thiel (Brunsberg, 1868).
- Epitome Legum*, ed. C. E. Zachariae von Lingenthal, reprinted in J. Zepos, P. Zepos, *Jus Graeco-romanum*, 4 (Athens, 1931), pp. 263-585.
- EUCHERIUS LUGDUNENSIS. *Instructiones*, PL, 50, cols. 773-822; CSEL, 31, ed. C. Wotke (1894), pp. 65-161.
- EUSEBIUS EP. CAESARIENSIS. *Chronica*, PG, 19, cols. 95-598. Armenian version; German trans. in GCS, 20, ed. J. Karst (1911).
- *Demonstratio Evangelica*, PG, 22, cols. 9-794; GCS, 23, ed. I. A. Heikel (1913).
- *Hieronymi Chronicon*, GCS, 24, 34, ed. R. Helm (1913, 1926).
- *Historia ecclesiastica*, PG, 20, cols. 45-906; GCS, 9, ed. E. Schwartz (1903-9).
- *Eusebii Chronicorum libri duo*, 1, ed. A. Mai, *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio*, 1, pt. 2 (Rome, 1825), pp. 1-39, and republished by A. Schoene, 1 (Berlin, 1875), appendix, pp. 63-102.
- EVAGRIUS. *The Ecclesiastical History*, ed. J. Bidez, L. Parmentier (London, 1898).
- FELIX, PAPA. *Epistolae*, PL, 58, cols. 895-978; also in *Collectio Avellana*, and *Epistolae Romanorum pontificum genuinae*, ed. Thiel (q.v.).
- FILASTRIUS. *Diversarum hereseon liber*, PL, 12, cols. 1111-1302; CSEL, 38, ed. F. Marx (1898).
- FLAVIUS LUCIUS DEXTER BARCINONENSIS. *Chronicon omnimodae historiae*, PL, 31, cols. 49-572.
- GAUDENTIUS BRESCIENSIS. *Sermones*, PL, 20, cols. 843-1002.
- GELASIUS, PAPA. *Epistolae et Decreta*, PL, 59, cols. 13-140; also in *Collectio Avellana* and *Epistolae Romanorum pontificum genuinae*, ed. Thiel (q.v.).
- GEORGIUS CYPRIUS. *Descriptio orbis romani*, ed. H. Gelzer (Leipzig, 1890).
- GERMANUS II, PATRIARCHA. *Epistolae ad Cyprios*, PG, 140, cols. 601-622.
- GRATIANUS, MAGISTER. *Decretum*, ed. E. Friedberg, *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, 1 (Leipzig, 1879).
- GREGORIUS MAGNUS. *S. Homiliae in Evangelia*, PL, 76, cols. 1077-1312.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- GEORGIUS MONACHUS. *Chronicon*, PG, 110; ed. E. G. von Muralt (Georgius Hamartolus, *Chronicon*) (St. Petersburg, 1859); ed. C. de Boor (Leipzig, 1904).
- GREGORIUS NAZIANZENUS, S. *Orationes XXVII-XLV*, PG, 36, cols. 11-664.
- *Poemata dogmatica*, PG, 37, cols. 397-522.
- *Poemata historica*, PG, 37, cols. 969-1600.
- GREGORIUS VII, PAPA. *Registrum*, ed. E. Caspar, *Das Register Gregors VII*, MGH, *Epistolae Selectae*, 2 (Berlin, 1920).
- GREGORIUS TURONENSIS EPISCOPUS. *Liber de miraculis beati Andreae Apostoli*, MGH, *Script. Rer. Merov.* 1, ed. M. Bonnet, pp. 821-46.
- *Liber in gloria martyrum*, *ibid.*, ed. W. Arndt, Br. Krusch, pp. 484-561.
- HERODOTUS. *Histories*, ed. and trans. by A. D. Godley, Loeb Classical Library (1930-38).
- Hieroclis synecdemus et notitiae episcopatum*, ed. G. Parthey (Berlin, 1866).
- HIERONYMUS, S. *Chronicon*, GCS, 24, 34, ed. R. Helm (1913-26) (in Eusebius, vol. 7, 1 and 2).
- *Contra Vigilantium liber*, PL, 23, cols. 353-68.
- *De viris illustribus*, PL, 23, cols. 631-760.
- *Epistolae*, CSEL, 54, ed. I. Hildberg (1910); ed. J. Lebourt in *Collection Guillaume Budé*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1949-55).
- *Liber ad Pammachium contra Joannem Hierosolymitanum*, PL, 23, cols. 371-414.
- HIPPOLYTUS ROMANUS, S. *Philosophoumena*, GCS, 26, ed. P. Wendland (1916).
- "Histoire monastiques géorgiennes," *AnBoll*, 36-37 (1917-18), ed. P. Peeters.
- HORMISDAS, PAPA. *Epistolae et Decreta*, PL, 63, cols. 367-534; also in *Collectio Avellana and Epistolae Romanorum pontificum genuinae*, ed. Thiel (q.v.).
- HUMBERTUS, CARDINALIS. *Adversus Graecorum calumnias*, PL, 143, cols. 929-74.
- IGNATIUS DIACONUS. *Vita Nicephori*, PG, 100, cols. 41-160; ed. C. de Boor (Leipzig, 1880).
- *Vita Tarasii*, ed. I. A. Heikel, *Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae* (Helsinki, 1889).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- INNOCENTIUS, PAPA, S. *Epistolae*, Mansi, 3, cols. 1028-1128; *PL*, 20, cols. 463-636.
- Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romae*, ed. G. B. de Rossi, 2 vols. (Rome, 1861-88), N. S., ed. A. Silvagni, 2 vols. (Rome 1922-35).
- IRENAEUS, S. *Contra Haereses*, *PG*, 7, cols. 433-1224.
- JOANNES CHRYSOSTOMUS, S. *De Precatione*, *PG*, 50, cols. 775-86.
 ——— *Homiliae*, *PG*, 48, 50, 51, 58, 60, 61.
- JOANNES DAMASCENUS, S. *De Imaginibus orationes tres*, *PG*, 94, cols. 1227-1420.
- JOANNES DIACONUS. S. *Gregorii Magni vita*, *PL*, 75, cols. 63-242.
- JOANNES SCHOLASTICUS. *Syntagma L Titulorum ceteraque eiusdem opera iuridica*, ed. V. Benešević, *Sitzungsberichte der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil-hist. Kl.* (1937), no. 23.
- JOHN VI, CATHOLICUS. *History of Armenia* (Jerusalem, 1867). (In Armenian).
- JUSTINUS, MARTYRUS, S. *Dialogus cum Tryphone Judaeo*, *PG*, 6, cols. 473-800.
- Kalendarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae*, ed. S. A. Morelli, 2 vols. (Rome, 1788).
- "Kitab al Unvan," ed. and trans. by A. A. Vasiliev in *Patrologia Orientalis*, 7.
- LANGLOIS, V. *Collection des historiens anciens et modernes de l'Arménie*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1867).
- Laudatio*, ed. M. Bonnet, *Acta Andreae cum Laudatione contexta et Martyrium Andreae graece, Passio Andreae latine*, in *AnBoll*, 13 (1894), pp. 309 seq., *Supplementum codicis apocryphi* (Paris, 1895), pp. 1-44.
- LEO MAGNUS, S. *Epistolae*, Mansi, 25, cols. 1211-1430; 6, cols. 1-430; *PL*, 54, cols. 581-1218.
 ——— *Sermones*, *PL*, 54, cols. 137-468.
- LEO IX, PAPA, S. *Epistolae*, *PL*, 143, cols. 591-794.
- Life of St. Peter the Iberian*, ed. N. Marr in *Palestinskij Sbornik*, 47 (1896).
- LIUTPRAND CREMONENSIS. *Legatio*, *MGH*, Ss 3, pp. 273-363; *Ss in usum scholarum*, ed. J. Becker (1915); Eng. trans. by F. A. Wright, *The Works of Liutprand of Cremona* (London, 1930).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- MAI, A., CARDINAL. *Patrum nova bibliotheca*, 4 (Rome, 1847).
 ——— *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio*, 1, pt. 2 (Rome, 1825), pp. 1-39.
- MALALAS, JOANNES. *Chronographia* (Bonn, 1831).
- Martyrdom of St. Andrew in Scythia*, in *The Contendings of the Apostles*, 2, Ethiopian text, ed. and trans. by E. A. Wallis Budge (London, 1901), pp. 215 seq.
- Martyrium Andreae prius, secundum*, in R. A. Lipsius, M. Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, 2, pt. 1 (Leipzig, 1898), pp. 46-64.
- Martyrium Hieronymianum*, ed. G. B. de Rossi, L. Duchesne, *AS*, Nov., 2, pt. 1 (Brussels, 1894), pp. 1-156.
- Martyrium Matthaei*, see *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, ed. J. A. Fabricius.
- MAXIMUS CONFESSOR, S. *Disputatio cum Pyrrho*, PG, 91, cols. 287-354.
 ——— *Epistolae, ibid.*, cols. 363-650.
- Menaia*. See *infra*, Symeon Metaphrastes.
- Menologii anonymi Byzantini saeculi X quae supersunt*, ed. V. V. Latyšev, 2 vols. (St. Petersburg, 1911-12).
- Menologium Graecum Basilii II*, PG, 117, cols. 19-614.
- MESARITES, NICHOLAS. *Opera*, ed. A. Heisenberg, "Neue Quellen zur Geschichte des lateinischen Kaisertums und der Kirchenunion," *Sitzungsberichte der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philhist. Kl.*, 1922, 3 vols. (Munich, 1923).
- MICHAEL SYRUS. *Chronicon*, ed. J. B. Chabot (Paris, 1899-1924).
- MICHAEL III, ANCHIALUS, PATRIARCHA. *Dialogus*, ed. Ch. Loparev, "Ob uniatsve Imperatora Manuila," *Vizantijskij Vremmenik*, 14 (1907), pp. 344-57; also ed. K. I. Dyobouniotes, *Epeteris Hetaireias Byzantinon Spoudon*, 15 (1939), pp. 38-51.
- Μνημεία ἀγιολογικά, ed. Th. Joannou (Venice, 1884).
- Narratio de Rebus Armeniae*, ed. and commentary by G. Garitte, *CSCO*, 132, *subsidia* 4 (Louvain, 1952).
- Narratio sive Martyrium S. Apostoli Andreae*, ed. M. Bonnet, *AnBoll*, 13 (1894), pp. 309-72; ed. *idem*, *Supplementum codicis apocryphi* (Paris, 1895), pp. 45-64.
- NICEPHORUS CALLISTUS XANTHOPULUS. *Historia ecclesiastica*, PG, 145, cols. 549 seq.; 146; 147, cols. 9-448.
- NICEPHORUS, PATRIARCHA, S. *Apologeticus pro Sacris Imaginibus*, PG, 100, cols. 533-834.
- NICOLAUS I, PAPA, S. *Epistolae*, MGH, *Epist.* 6.
- Novellae et aureae bullae imperatorum post Justinianum*, ed. J. Zepos, P. Zepos, *Jus Graeco-romanum*, 1 (Athens, 1931).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Opera Patrum Apostolicorum*, ed. F. X. Funk (Tübingen, 1881).
- OPTATUS MILEVITANUS, S. *Libri septem*, CSEL, 26 ed. C. Ziwsa (1893).
- ORIGENES. *Commentarii in Matthaeum*, GCS, 38, ed. E. Klostermann (1933).
- PANARETUS. See P. Risso, in Secondary Authorities.
- PAPADOPOULOS-KERAMEUS, A. *Varia sacra graeca (Zapiski istor. filol. fakulteta imp. S. Peterburgsk. universiteta*, 95 [St. Petersburg, 1909]).
- Passio S. Andreae Apostoli*, see M. Bonnet, *Supplementum*.
- PAULINUS NOLANUS, S. *Carmina*, CSEL, 30, ed. W. von Hartel (1894).
- *Epistolae*, CSEL, 29, ed. W. von Hartel (1894).
- PAULUS, ARCHIPRESBYTER. *Vita S. Petri Iberi*, ed. N. Marr, *Pravoslavnyj Palestinskij Sbornik*, 47 (1896), pp. 1-125.
- PETRUS CHRYSOLOGUS RAVENATENSIS. *Sermones*, PL, 52, cols. 183-680.
- PETRUS DAMIANUS, S. *Sermones*, PL, 144, cols. 505-924.
- PHILOSTORGIUS. *Historia ecclesiastica*, GCS, 21 (ed. J. Bidez, 1913).
- PHOTIUS, PATRIARCHA, S. *Ad Amphilochium*, PG, 101.
- *Bibliotheca*, PG, 103, cols. 41 seq.; 104, cols. 1-356.
- *Contra Manichaeos*, PG, 102, cols. 15-264.
- *Homiliae*, ed. S. Aristarchis, 2 vols. (Constantinople, 1900).
- ed. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, "Fotija archiepiskopa Konstantinopol'skago, o grobe Gospoda našego Iisusa Christa i drugija malyja ego tvorenija," *Pravoslavnyj Palestinskij Sbornik*, 31 (1892), pp. 1-298.
- PLINIUS SECUNDUS, C. *Historia Naturalis*, Loeb Classical Library, 9 vols., ed. and trans. by H. Rackham, W. H. S. Jones (1938-51).
- PRISCILLIANUS. *Liber ad Damasum*, CSEL, 18, ed. G. Schepps (1889), pp. 34-43.
- Ὁ Πρόχειρος Νόμος, ed. C. E. Zachariae von Lingenthal (Heidelberg, 1837).
- PROCLUS, CONSTANTINOPOLITANUS ARCHIEP. *Epistolae*, PG, 65, cols. 851-86.
- *Sermones*, *ibid.*, cols. 679-850.
- PROCOPIUS. *De aedificiis Justiniani* (Bonn), pp. 170 seq.; ed. J. Haury (Teubner, 1913), pp. 24 seq.
- Prophetarum Vitae Fabulosae, Indices apostolorum discipulorumque Domini, Dorotheo, Epiphanio, Hippolyto aliisque vindicatae*, ed. Th. Schermann, Teubner ser. (Leipzig, 1907).
- PSEUDO-AUGUSTINUS. *De vera et falsa poenitentia*, PL, 40, cols. 1113-30.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- PSEUDO-CHRYSTOSTOMUS. *Homilia in duodecim Apostolos*, PG, 59, cols. 495-98.
- PSEUDO-CLEMENTINES. "Die Pseudo-Klementinen," GCS, 42, ed. B. Rehm (1953).
- PSEUDO-DOROTHEUS. See *Prophetarum Vitae fabulosae*, ed. Th. Schermann, pp. 131-160.
- PSEUDO-EPIPHANIUS. See *ibid.*, pp. 1-25, 107-131.
- PSEUDO-HIPPOLYTUS. See *ibid.*, pp. 163-170.
- PSEUDO-MELLITUS. *De Passione Joannis Evangelistae*, ed. J. A. Fabricius, *Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti*, 3 (Hamburg, 1719), pp. 604-24.
- PSEUDO-PANTALEO (PANTALEEMON) DIACONUS. *Contra Graecos*, PG, 140, cols. 487-574.
- PTOLEMAEUS, CLAUDIUS. *Geographiae Codex Urbinatus Graecus* 82, ed. P. Franchi de' Cavalieri (Leipzig, 1932).
- RATRAMNUS CORBEIENSIS. *Contra Graecorum opposita*, PL, 121, cols. 225-346.
- RUFINUS AQUILEIENSIS. *Pseudo-Clementis Recognitiones*, PG, 1, cols. 1187-1474.
- RUFINUS, MAGISTER. *Summa Decretorum*, ed. H. Singer (Paderborn, 1902).
- Russian Primary Chronicle*, trans. by S. H. Cross, *Harvard Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature*, 12 (1930); new ed. O. P. Sherbowitz-Wetzor (Cambridge, Mass., 1953).
- SALVIANUS. *De gubernatione Dei*, PL, 53, cols. 25-158; CSEL 8, ed. F. Pauly (1883); also in MGH, *Auct. ant.*, 1, ed. K. Halm, pp. 1-108.
- SCHOENE, A. *Eusebii Chronicorum libri duo*, 1 (Berlin, 1875).
- Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum*, ed. Th. Preger, 2 vols. (Teubner, Leipzig, 1901-7).
- SIMPLICIUS, PAPA. *Epistolae*, PL, 58, cols. 35-62; also in *Collectio Avellana* CSEL, 35, and *Epistolae Romanorum pontificum genuinae*, ed. Thiel (q.v.).
- SIRICIUS, PAPA, S. *Epistolae*, Mansi, 3, cols. 655-75; PL, 13, cols. 1131-1202.
- SOCRATES. *Historia ecclesiastica*, PG, 67, cols. 28-842.
- SOZOMENUS. *Historia ecclesiastica*, PG, 67, cols. 843-1630.
- STRABO. *Rerum geographicarum libri XVII*, Loeb Classical Library, 8 vols., ed. with an English trans. by H. L. Jones (1917-32).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- SYMEON METAPHRASTES. *Commemoratio S. Andreae*, in *Menaia Novembris* (Venice, 1843), pp. 235-45; reprinted in *Μηναῖον τοῦ Νοεμβρίου* (Athens, 1926), pp. 318-25.
- *Martyrium sancti et magni martyris Artemii*, PG, 115, cols. 1160-1202.
- SYMMACHUS, PAPA. *Epistolae et Decreta*, PL, 62, cols. 49-80; also in *Epistolae Romanorum pontificum genuinae*, ed. Thiel (q.v.).
- Synaxarium Ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae. Acta Sanctorum, Propylaea, November*, ed. H. Delehay (Brussels, 1902).
- SYNCELLUS, GEORGIUS. *Chronographia* (Bonn, 1829).
- Synopsis Basilicorum*, ed. C. E. Zachariae von Lingenthal, reprinted in J. Zepos, P. Zepos, *Jus Graeco-romanum*, 5 (Athens, 1931).
- Synopsis Minor*, ed. C. E. Zachariae von Lingenthal, reprinted in J. Zepos, P. Zepos, *Jus Graeco-romanum*, 6 (Athens, 1931), pp. 319-547.
- Synlagma Canonum XIV Titulorum*, PG, 104, cols. 441-970.
- TERTULLIANUS, QUINTUS SEPTIMUS FLORENS. *Adversus Judaeos*, CSEL, 70, ed. E. Kroymann (1942), pp. 251-331.
- *Adversus Marcionem*, PL, 2, cols. 267-556; CSEL, 47, ed. E. Kroymann (1906), pp. 290-650.
- *De Pudicitia*, CSEL, 20, ed. A. Reifferscheid, G. Wissowa (1890).
- *Liber der praescriptione haereticorum*, CSEL, 70, ed. E. Kroymann (1942), pp. 13-92.
- *Opera quae supersunt omnia*, ed. F. Oehler, 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1851-4).
- THEODORETUS CYRENSIS. *Historia ecclesiastica*, PG, 82, cols. 881-1280; GCS, 19, ed. L. Parmentier (1911).
- *Epistolae*, PG, 83, cols. 1173-1494.
- *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG, 80, cols. 857-1998.
- THEODORUS BALSAMON, ZONARAS, ARISTENUS. *In Canones SS. Apostolorum Conciliorum... commentaria*, PG, 137-8.
- THEODORUS LECTOR. *Excerpta ex Historia ecclesiastica*, PG, 86, cols. 165-216.
- THEODORUS STUDITA, S. *Epistolae*, PG, 99, cols. 903-1670.
- THEODOSIUS. *De Situ Terrae Sanctae*, in *Itinera Hierosolymitana*, CSEL, 39 (ed. P. Geyer, 1898), pp. 137-50.
- THEOPHANES CONTINUATUS (Bonn, 1838).
- THEOPHANES, S. *Chronographia* (Bonn, 1839-41); ed. C. De Boor (Leipzig, 1883-85).
- THIEL, A. *Epistolae Romanorum pontificum genuinae* (Brunsbergae, 1868).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

TURNER, C. H. (ed.), *Ecclesiae occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1899-1929).

VICTOR VITENSIS. *De persecutione vandalica*, *PL*, 58, cols. 179-260; *CSEL*, 7, ed. C. Schenkl, pp. 1-107.

VICTRICIUS, S. *Liber de laude sanctorum*, *PL*, 20, col. 448C.

TYPICA:

BAUMSTARK, A. "Das Typikon der Patmos-Handschrift 266," *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft*, 6 (1926), pp. 98-111.

DMITRIJEVSKIJ, A. *Opisanie liturgiĭeskich rukopisej, Typika*, 1 (Kiev, 1895).

KRASNOSEL'CEV, N. TH. "Tipik cerkvi sv. Sofii v Konstantinopole IX v.," *Letopis istor. filolog. obščestva*, 1 (1892), pp. 156-254; reviewed by D. Beljaev in *Žurnal minist. narodnago prosvěšćenija*, 283 (1892), pp. 363-79.

—— "Kizučeniju 'Tipika Velikoj Cerkvi'," *ibid.*, 3 (1896), pp. 329-44.

VENANTIUS FORTUNATUS. *De Virginitate* (*Miscellanea, lib. VIII*, chap. 6), *PL*, 88, cols. 266-76; *MGH, Auct. ant.*, 4, pt. 1, pp. 181-91.

Vita S. Euthymii iunioris, ed. L. Petit in *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*, 8 (1903), pp. 155-205, 503-27.

Vita S. Evaristi, ed. C. van de Vorst, *AnBoll*, 41 (1923), pp. 288-325.

Vita S. Joannis, Episcopi Gothiae, *AS*, June, 7, pp. 167-72.

Vita S. Nicolai Studitae, *PG*, 105, cols. 863-926.

ZACHARIAH OF MYTILENE. *Syrian Chronicle*, Engl. trans. by F. J. Hamilton, E. W. Brooks (London, 1899).

SECONDARY AUTHORITIES:

ACHELIS, H. "Der älteste deutsche Kalender," *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1 (1900), pp. 308-335.

ALAND, K. "Petrus in Rom," *Historische Zeitschrift*, 183 (1957), pp. 491-516.

ANASTOS, M. V. 'Εκκλησία καὶ πολιτεία εἰς τὴν πρώτην εἰκονομαχικὴν περίοδον, in *Festschrift honoring Hamilcar Alivizatos* (Athens, [1958?]).

—— "The Transfer of Illyricum to the Jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople in 632," *Silloge Bizantina in honore di S. G. Mercati, Studi bizantini e neoellenici*, 9 (1957).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BANDURI, A. *Imperium orientale*, 2 (Paris, 1711).
- BARONIUS, CARDINAL CAESAR. *Annales Ecclesiastici*, ed. A. Pagi (Lucca, 1738-59); ed. and cont. by A. Theiner (Bar-le-Duc, 1867).
- *Matryrologium Romanum*, 2nd ed. (Antwerp, 1589).
- BATIFFOL, P. *Cathedra Petri, études d'histoire ancienne de l'Eglise* (Paris, 1938).
- "De quelques homélies de S. Jean Chrysostome et de la version gothique des écritures," *Revue biblique*, 8 (1899), pp. 566-72.
- *L'Eglise naissante et le Catholicisme* (Paris, 1909).
- "Fragmente der Kirchengeschichte des Philostorgius," *Römische Quartalschrift*, 3 (1889), pp. 252-89.
- "Les présents de S. Cyrille à la cour de Constantinople," *Etudes de liturgie et d'archéologie chrétiennes* (Paris, 1919), pp. 154-79. (Also in *Bulletin d'ancienne littérature et d'archéologie chrétiennes*, 1 [1911], pp. 247-64).
- *Quaestiones Philostorgianae* (Paris, 1891).
- *Le siège apostolique, 359-451* (Paris, 1924).
- BAUR, J. CH. *Der heilige Johannes Chrysostomus und seine Zeit*, 2 vols. (Munich, 1930).
- BAYNES, N. H. "Alexandria and Constantinople. A Study in Ecclesiastical Diplomacy," *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, 12 (1926), pp. 145-56; reprinted in *Byzantine Studies and Other Essays* (London, 1955), pp. 97-115.
- "Topographica Constantinopolitana," *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 31 (1911), pp. 266-68.
- BEES, N. A. "Weiteres zum Kult des hl. Artemios," *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher*, 1 (1920), pp. 384-85.
- BERAN, J. "Hat Gregor der Grosse dem Embolismus der römischen Liturgie den Namen des hl. Andreas beigefügt?" *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, 55 (N.S. 15, 1941), pp. 83 seq.
- BLATT, F. *Die lateinischen Bearbeitungen der Acta Andreae et Matthiae apud anthropophagos* (Giessen, 1930).
- BLUMENTHAL, M. *Formen und Motive in der apokryphen Apostelgeschichte, Texte und Untersuchungen*, 59 (Leipzig, 1933).
- BONNET, M. "Bemerkungen über die ältesten Schriften von der Himmelfahrt Mariae," *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 23 (1880), pp. 239, seq.
- "La Passion de l'Apôtre André, en quelle langue a-t-elle été écrite?" *BZ*, 3 (1894), pp. 458-469.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BRÉHIER, L. *Grégoire le Grand, les états barbares et la conquête arabe* (590-757), Histoire de l'Eglise, 5, ed. A. Fliche, V. Martin (Paris, 1947).
- BRUYNE, DOM DE. "Les plus anciens prologues latins des Evangiles," *Revue bénédictine*, 40 (1928), pp. 193-214.
- BUONAIUTI, E. *Il Cristianesimo nell' Africa* (Bari, 1928).
- CABROL, F., LECLERCQ, H. "Afrique," in *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, 1 (Paris, 1904), cols. 63 seq.
- CAMPENHAUSEN, H. VON. *Ambrosius von Milan als Kirchenpolitiker* (Berlin, Leipzig, 1929).
- "Lehrreihen und Bischofsreihen im 2. Jahrhundert," In *Memoriam Ernst Lohmeyer* (Stuttgart, 1951), pp. 240-49.
- CASPAR, E. *Die älteste römische Bischofsliste. Kritische Studien zum Formproblem des eusebianischen Kanons sowie zur Geschichte der Bischofslisten und ihrer Entstehung aus apostolischen Sukzessionsreihen* (Königsberg, 1926).
- *Geschichte des Papsttums*, 2 vols. (Tübingen, 1930-33).
- "Primatus Petri," *Zeitschrift der Savigny Stiftung*, 47, *Kanonistische Abteilung*, 16 (1927), pp. 253-331.
- CAVALLERA, F. *Saint Jérôme, sa vie et son oeuvre*, 2 vols. (Louvain, Paris, 1922).
- *Le schisme d'Antioche* (Paris, 1905).
- CHARANIS, P. *Church and State in the Later Roman Empire. The Religious Policy of Anastasius the First* (Madison, Wisc., 1939).
- CLAVIER, H. "La primauté de Pierre d'après les pseudo-Clémentines," *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuse*, 3 (1956), pp. 298-307.
- CORSSEN, P. *Monarchianische Prologe zu den vier Evangelien; ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Kanons, Texte und Untersuchungen*, 15 (Leipzig, 1896).
- CULLMANN, O. *Saint Pierre, disciple, apôtre, martyr; histoire et théologie* (Neufchâtel, Paris, 1952).
- CUMONT, F. "Hypsistos," *Supplément à la Revue de l'instruction publique en Belgique* (Brussels, 1897).
- CURETON, W. *Ancient Syriac Documents relative to the Earliest Establishment of Christianity in Edessa and the Neighbouring Countries* (London, 1864).
- DARROUZÈS, J. "Notes d'épistolographie et d'histoire de textes," *Revue des études byzantines*, 12 (1954), pp. 176-88.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- DELEHAYE, H. *Les origines du culte des martyrs* (2nd. ed., Brussels, 1933).
 ——— "Les recueils antiques de miracles des saints," *AnBoll*, 43 (1925), pp. 5-85, 305-25.
 ——— "Loca Sanctorum," *ibid.*, 48 (1930), pp. 5-64.
 DEMOUGEOT, E. "A propos des partages de l'Illyricum en 386-395," *Actes du VI^e congrès international d'études byzantines*, 1 (Paris, 1950) pp. 87-92.
 ——— *De l'unité à la division de l'empire romain (395-410). Essai sur le gouvernement impérial* (Paris, 1951).
 DER NERSESSIAN, S. "Remarks on the Date of the Menologium and the Psalter written for Basil II," *Byzantion*, 15 (1940-1), pp. 104-25.
 DEVOS, P. "Actes de Thomas et actes de Paul," *AnBoll*, 69 (1951), pp. 119-30.
 DIEKAMP, F. *Hippolytus von Theben, Texte und Untersuchungen* (Münster i. W., 1898).
 DÖLGER, F. "Europas Gestaltung im Spiegel der fränkisch-byzantinischen Auseinandersetzung des 9. Jahrhunderts," in *Der Vertrag von Verdun 843*, ed. Th. Meyer (Leipzig, 1943), pp. 203-73; reprinted in F. Dölger, *Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt* (Speyer a. R., 1953), pp. 282-369.
 ——— *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches*, 1 (Munich, Berlin, 1924).
 ——— "Rom in der Gedankenwelt der Byzantiner," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 56 (1937), pp. 1-42; reprinted in *Byzanz und die europäische Staatenwelt* (Speyer a. R., 1953), pp. 70-115.
 DOWNEY, G. "The Builder of the Original Church of the Apostles at Constantinople," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 6 (1951), pp. 51-80.
 ——— *A Study of the Comites Orientis and the Consulares Syriae* (Princeton, 1939).
 DUBOWY, E. "Klemens von Rom über die Reise Pauli nach Spanien," *Biblische Studien*, 19 (1914).
 DU CANGE, C. D. *Historia Byzantina. Constantinopolis Christiana* (Paris, 1680).
 DUCHESNE, L. "Les anciens recueils de légendes apostoliques," *Compte-rendu du troisième congrès scientifique international des catholiques*, 1894 (Brussels, 1895), section 5, *Sciences historiques*, pp. 67-79.
 ——— "L'Illyricum ecclésiastique," *BZ*, 1 (892), pp. 531-50.
 ——— *L'Eglise au VI^e siècle* (Paris, 1925).
 ——— *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*, 1 (2nd. ed., Paris, 1907).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- DUCHESNE, L. *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise*, 4 vols. (3rd ed., Paris, 1923).
 ——— *Liber Pontificalis*, 1 (Paris, 1886).
 ——— *Martyrium Hieronymianum*, AS, November 2, part 1 (Brussels, 1894), pp. lxxv seq.
 ——— *Origines du culte chrétien* (5th. ed., Paris, 1909).
 DUDDEN, F. H. *Gregory the Great, His Place in History and Thought*, 2 vols. (London, 1905).
 ——— *The Life and Times of St. Ambrose* (Oxford, 1935).
 DU SAUSSAY, A. *Andreas Frater Simonis Petri seu de gloria S. Andreae apostoli, libri XII* (Paris, 1656).
 DVORNIK, F. "Emperors, Popes and General Councils," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 6 (1951), pp. 1-23.
 ——— *Les légendes de Constantine et de Méthode vues de Byzance* (Prague, 1933).
 ——— "The Patriarch Photius and Iconoclasm," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 7 (1953), pp. 67-97.
 ——— *The Photian Schism, History and Legend* (Cambridge, 1948).
 ——— "Pope Gelasius and Emperor Anastasius I," *BZ*, 44 (1951), pp. 111-16.
 ——— *Les Slaves, Byzance et Rome au IX^e Siècle* (Paris, 1926).
 DŽAVAKOV, I. "Propovedničeskaja dějatel'nost' ap. Andreja i sv. Niny. II. Apostol Andrej v Gruzii," *Žurnal ministerstva narodnago Prosveščeniya*, 333 (St. Petersburg, 1901), pp. 77-113.
 EHRHARDT, A. A. T. *The Apostolic Succession* (London, 1953).
 ——— "The Gospels in the Muratorian Fragment," *Ostkirchliche Studien*, 2 (1953), pp. 121-38.
 EITEL, A. "Die spanische Kirche in vorgermanischer Zeit," *Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiete der mittleren und neueren Geschichte und ihrer Hilfswissenschaften. Eine Festgabe zum 70. Geburtstag Prof. H. Finke* (Münster i. W., 1925), pp. 1-22.
 ENSSLIN, W. "Kaiser Julians Gesetzgebungswerk und Reichsverwaltung," *Klio*, 18 (1922-3), pp. 104-99.
 ——— *Theodorich der Grosse* (Munich, 1947).
 FAIVRE, J. "Alexandrie," *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique*, 1 (1914), cols. 305 seq.
 FAYE, E. DE. *Origène, sa vie, son oeuvre, sa pensée*, 3 vols. (2nd. ed., Paris, 1923-8).
 FERRON, J., Lapeyre, G. "Carthage," *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique*, 11 (Paris, 1939), cols. 1178 seq.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- FISCHER, M. F. *De patriarcharum Constantinopolitanorum catalogis et de chronologia primorum patriarcharum* (Leipzig, 1894).
- FLAMION, J. *Les actes apocryphes de l'Apôtre André* (Louvain, Paris, Brussels, 1911). See the review by H. Coppieters in *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, 13 (1912), pp. 325-32; by E. Hennecke in *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 38 (1913), cols. 73-4; by M. R. James in *Journal of Theological Studies*, 13 (1912), pp. 435-7.
- "Les actes apocryphes de Pierre" in *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, 9 (1908), pp. 233-54, 465-90; 10 (1909), pp. 1-29, 245-77; 11 (1910), pp. 5-28, 233-56, 447-70, 675-92; 12 (1911), pp. 209-30.
- FRANKO, I. "Beiträge aus dem Kirchenslavischen zu den Apokryphen aus dem N.T. Zu den Gnostischen Περίοδοι Πέτρου," *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 3 (1902), pp. 315-35; 7 (1906), pp. 151-71, 224-35; 17 (1916), pp. 207-10.
- FUHRMANN, H. "Studien zur Geschichte mittelalterlicher Patriarchate," *Zeitschrift der Savigny Stiftung*, 70, *Kanonistische Abteilung*, 39 (1953), pp. 112-76.
- GAGÉ, J. "Nouveaux aspects de l'Afrique chrétienne," *Annales de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes de Gand*, 1 (1937), pp. 181-230.
- GAMS, P. B. *Die Kirchengeschichte Spaniens*, 2 (Regensburg, 1864-76).
- GARCIA VILLADA, Z. *Historia ecclesiástica de España* (Madrid, 1929).
- GARITTE, G. "La *Narratio de rebus Armeniae*. Edition critique et commentaire," *CSCO*, 132, *Subsidia*, t. 4 (Louvain, 1952).
- GELZER, H. *Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie* (Leipzig, 1880-98).
- GENTZ, G., ALAND, K. "Die Quellen der Kirchengeschichte des Nicephorus und ihre Bedeutung für die Konstituierung des Textes der älteren Kirchenhistoriker," *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 42 (1949), pp. 104-41.
- GERLAND, E. *Die Genesis der Notitiae episcopatum*, in *Corpus notitiarum episcopatum Ecclesiae Orientalis Graecae*, 1 (Kadiköy, 1931).
- GEROLA, G. "Il ripristino della capella di S. Andrea nel palazzo vescovile di Ravenna," *Felix Ravenna*, N.S., 41 (1932), pp. 71 seq.
- GLANVELL, V. WOLF VON. *Die Kanonessammlung des Kardinals Deusdedit* (Paderborn, 1905).
- GOGUEL, M. "Le livre d'Oscar Cullmann sur saint Pierre," *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuse*, 35 (1955), pp. 196-209.
- GORDILLO, M. "Photius et Primatus Romanus," *OCP*, 6 (1940), pp. 6-39.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- GRIMM, J. *Andreas und Elene* (Cassel, 1841).
- GRISAR, H. "Der gelasianische Messkanon," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 10 (1886), pp. 1-35.
- GRUMEL, V. "L'annexion de l'Illyricum oriental, de la Sicile et de la Calabre au patriarcat de Constantinople," *Recherches des sciences religieuses* (Mélanges Lebreton), 40 (1952), pp. 191-200.
- "L'Illyricum de la mort de Valentinien I^{er} (375) à la mort de Stilicon (408)," *Revue des études byzantines*, 9 (1951), pp. 5-46.
- "Les préliminaires du schisme de Michel Cérulaire ou la question romaine avant 1054," *Revue des études byzantines*, 10 (1953), pp. 5-23.
- *Les régestes des actes du patriarcat de Constantinople*, 1 (Istanbul, 1936).
- GRÜTZMACHER, G. *Hieronymus. Eine biographische Studie zur alten Kirchengeschichte*, 3 vols. (Leipzig, Berlin, 1901-08).
- GUIDI, I. "Gli Atti Apocrifi degli Apostoli nei testi copti, arabi ed etiopici," *Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana*, 2 (1888).
- GUTSCHMID, A. von. "Die Königsnamen in den apokryphen Apostelgeschichten," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, Neue Folge*, 19 (1864), pp. 161-83, 380-401; reprinted in *Kleine Schriften*, ed. F. Rühl, 2 (Leipzig, 1890), pp. 332-94.
- HAACKE, W. "Die Glaubensformel des Papstes Hormisdas im Acacianischen Schisma," *Analecta Gregoriana*, 20 (Rome, 1939).
- HAASE, F. *Apostel und Evangelisten in den orientalischen Überlieferungen* (Münster i. W., 1922).
- "Patriarch Dioskur I. nach monophysitischen Quellen," *Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen*, ed. Max Sdrulek, 6 (1908), pp. 141-233.
- HAGENMAYER, H. *Die Kreuzzugsbriefe aus den Jahren 1088-1100. Eine Quellensammlung zur Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzuges* (Innsbruck, 1901).
- HALLER, J. *Das Papsttum, Idee und Wirklichkeit*, 1 (Urach and Stuttgart, 1950).
- HARAPIN, T. *Primatus pontificis Romani in Concilio Chalcedonensi et Ecclesiae dissidentes* (Quaracchi, 1923).
- HARNACK, A. von. *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur*, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1893-1904).
- *Kritik des Neuen Testaments von einem griechischen Philosophen des 3. Jahrhunderts, Texte und Untersuchungen*, 37 (Leipzig, 1911).
- HARNACK, A. von. *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* (Leipzig, 1924).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- HEARD, R. G. "The Old Gospel Prologues," *Journal of Theological Studies*, N.S. 6 (1955), pp. 1-16.
- HEFELE, C. J., LECLERCQ, H. *Histoire des Conciles*, 11 vols. in 21 (Paris, 1907-52).
- HEILER, F. *Altkirchliche Autonomie und päpstlicher Zentralismus* (Munich, 1941).
- HENNECKE, I. E. *Handbuch zu den neutestamentlichen Apokryphen* (Tübingen, 1904 and 1914).
- *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* (2nd. ed., Tübingen, 1924).
- "Zur christlichen Apokryphenliteratur," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 45 (1926), pp. 309-15.
- HERGENRÖTHER, J. *Photius, Patriarch von Konstantinopel*, 3 vols. (Regensburg, 1867-69).
- HERMAN, E. "Chalkedon und die Ausgestaltung des Konstantinopolitanischen Primats," in A. Grillmeir, H. Bacht, *Das Konzil von Chalkedon*, 2 (Würzburg, 1953), pp. 459-90.
- HEUSSI, K. *Die römische Petrustradition in kritischer Sicht* (Tübingen, 1955).
- HOLL, K. *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, 3 vols. (Tübingen, 1927-28).
- HONIG, R. *Beiträge zur Entwicklung des Kirchenrechts* (Göttingen, 1954, Göttinger Rechtswissenschaftliche Studien, Heft 12).
- HONIGMAN, E. "Le 'Corpus notitiarum episcopatum'," *Byzantion*, 11 (1936), pp. 340-62.
- "Juvenal of Jerusalem," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 5 (1950), pp. 209-78.
- HÖSLINGER, R. *Die alte afrikanische Kirche* (Vienna, 1935).
- JANIN, R. *Constantinople byzantine* (Paris, 1950).
- "Etudes de topographie byzantine," *Echos d'Orient*, 36 (1937), pp. 288-308.
- *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'empire byzantin*, pt. 1, 3 (Paris, 1953).
- JUGIE, M. "Photius et la primauté de Saint Pierre et du pape," *Bessarione*, 23 (1919), pp. 120-30; 24 (1920), pp. 16-76.
- "S. Jean Chrysostome et la primauté de S. Pierre," *Echos d'Orient*, 11 (1908), pp. 5-15, 193-202.
- *Le schisme byzantin* (Paris, 1941).
- JUGIE, M. *Theologia dogmatica christianorum orientalium*, 1 (Paris, 1926).
- JUNGSMANN, J. A. *Missarum Sollemnia* (Vienna, 1948).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- KAUFFMANN, F. *Aus der Schule des Wulfila. Auxenti Dorostorensis epistula de fide, vita et obitu Wulfilae, im Zusammenhang mit der Dissertatio Maximi contra Ambrosium* (Strassburg, 1899).
- KEKELIDZE, K. *Die Bekehrung Georgiens zum Christentum* (Leipzig, 1928).
- KELLNER, K. A. H. *Heortologie, oder geschichtliche Entwicklung des Kirchenjahres und der Heiligenfeste von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart* (2nd. ed., Freiburg i. Br., 1906).
- KIDD, B. J. *A History of the Church to A.D. 461*, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1922).
- KOCH, H. "Cathedra Petri, neue Untersuchungen über die Anfänge der Primatslehre," *Hefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 2 (Giessen, 1930).
- "Gelasius im kirchenpolitischen Dienste seiner Vorgänger der Päpste Simplicius und Felix III," *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie, Phil.-hist. Klasse*, 6 (Munich, 1935).
- KONSTANTINIDIS, CH. "La fête de l'apôtre saint André dans l'Eglise de Constantinople à l'époque byzantine et aux temps modernes," *Mélanges en l'honneur de Mgr. M. Andrieu, Revue des sciences religieuses*, volume hors série (Strassburg, 1956), pp. 243-61.
- KORNEMANN, E. "Dioecesis," in Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclopädie*, 5 (Stuttgart, 1905), cols. 727-34.
- KRAFT, B. "Andreas," in *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, 1, ed. M. Buchberger (Freiburg i. Br., 1930), col. 411.
- KRASNOSEL'CEV, N. TH. "K izučeniju 'Tipika Velikoj Cerkvi,'" *Letopis istoriko-filolog. obščestva pri imper. Novorossijskom universitete, Vizantijskoe otdelenie*, 3 (Odessa, 1896) pp. 329-44.
- "Tipik cerkvi sv. Sofii v Konstantinopole IX v.," *ibid.*, 1 (1892), pp. 156-254.
- KRUMBACHER, K. *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur* (Munich, 1897), pp. 350 seq.
- KRŽIŠNIK, C. "O pravni naravi Epanagoge," *Slovenski Pravniki*, 49 (Ljubljana, 1935), pp. 335-49.
- KUHN, G. *Das muratorische Fragment über die Bücher des Neuen Testaments* (Zürich, 1892).
- LAGRANGE, M. J. *Evangile selon saint Luc* (7th. ed., Paris, 1948).
- LANGEN, J. *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, 1, bis zum Pontifikate Leos I (Bonn, 1881).
- LANZONI, F. *Le diocesi d'Italia dalle origini al principio del secolo VII (an. 604)* (Faenza, 1927).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- LA PIANA, G. "The Roman Church at the End of the Second Century," *Harvard Theological Review*, 18 (1925), pp. 201-77.
- LAURENT, J. *L'Arménie entre Byzance et l'Islam depuis la conquête arabe jusqu'en 886* (Paris, 1919).
- LECLERCO, H. *L'Afrique chrétienne* (Paris, 1904).
- *L'Espagne chrétienne* (Paris, 1906).
- "Gallicane (Eglise)," *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, 6 (Paris, 1929), cols. 395-403.
- LEFEBVRE, G. "Egypte chrétienne, à propos de S. Luc," *Annales du service des antiquités*, 10 (1909).
- LEHMANN, K. "Ein Reliefbild des heiligen Artemios in Konstantinopel," *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher*, 1 (1920), pp. 381-84.
- LEWIS, A. S. "The Mythological Acts of the Apostles," *Horae Semiticae*, 4 (London, 1904), pp. 1-30.
- LIECHTENHAN, R. "Die pseudoepigraphische Litteratur der Gnostiker," *Zeitschrift für die neutestament. Wissenschaft*, 3 (1902), pp. 222-237, 286-99.
- *Die Offenbarung im Gnosticismus* (Göttingen, 1901).
- LIGHTFOOT, J. B. *The Apostolic Fathers*, part 1; *St. Clement of Rome* (London, 1890).
- LINCK, H. *Zur Übersetzung und Erläuterung der Kanones IV, VI, und VII des Konzils von Nicaea* (Giessen, 1908).
- LIPSIUS, R. A. *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden*, 2 vols. in 3 (Brunswick, 1883-97).
- LOOMIS, L. R. See *infra*, J. T. Shotwell.
- LOPAREV, C. "Ob Uniatstve imperatora Manuila Komnena," *Viz-antijskij Vremennik*, 14 (1907), pp. 334-57.
- LÜBECK, K. *Reichseinteilung und kirchliche Hierarchie des Orients bis zum Ausgange des vierten Jahrhunderts* (Münster i. W., 1901).
- MAAS, P. "Artemioskult in Konstantinopel," *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher*, 1 (1920), pp. 377-80.
- MAASSEN, F. B. C. *Geschichte der Quellen und der Literatur des canonischen Rechts im Abendlande bis zum Ausgange des Mittelalters* (Graz, 1870).
- *Der Primat des Bischofs von Rom und die alten Patriarchalkirchen* (Bonn, 1853).
- MAGNIN, E. *L'Eglise visigothique au VII^e siècle* (Paris, 1912).
- MAI, CARDINAL, A. *Patrum nova bibliotheca*, 4 (Rome, 1847).
- MARQUARDT, K. J. *L'administration romaine*, pt. 2: *L'organisation de l'empire romain*, in *Manuel des antiquités romaines*, ed. T. Mommsen,

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- K. J. Marquardt (French trans., Paris, 1892, in German, 2nd ed., Leipzig, 1881).
- MARTIN, T. O. "The twenty-eighth Canon of Chalcedon, a Background Note," in A. Grillmaier, H. Bacht, *Das Konzil von Chalcedon*, 2 (Würzburg, 1953), pp. 433-58.
- MARX, B. "Der homiletische Nachlass des Basileios von Seleukia," *OCP*, 7 (1941), pp. 329-69.
- MESNAGE, P. J. *Le Christianisme en Afrique, origines, développements, extension* (Paris, 1914).
- METZGER, G. *Die Afrikanische Kirche*, Dissertation (Tübingen, 1934).
- METZNER, E. *Die Verfassung der Kirche in den zwei ersten Jahrhunderten unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Schriften Harnacks* (Danzig, 1920).
- MICHEL, A. *Humbert und Kerularios*, 2 vols. (Paderborn, 1924-30).
- "Der Kampf um das politische oder petrinische Prinzip der Kirchenführung," in A. Grillmaier, H. Bacht, *Das Konzil von Chalcedon*, 2 (Würzburg, 1953), pp. 491-562.
- "Schisma und Kaiserhof im Jahre 1054. Michael Psellus," in *L'Eglise et les églises, 1054-1954*, 1 (Chevetogne, 1954), pp. 351-440.
- MILLER, E. "Fragments inédits de Théodore le Lecteur et de Jean d'Egée," *Revue archéologique*, N.S. 26 (1873), pp. 273-88, 396-403.
- MOLLAND, E. "Le développement de l'idée de succession apostolique," *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuse*, 34 (1954), pp. 1-29.
- MOMMSEN, TH. E. "Aktenstücke zur Kirchengeschichte aus dem Cod. Cap. Novar. 30," *Neues Archiv*, 11 (1886), pp. 362-364.
- *Römische Geschichte*, 5 vols. (Berlin, 1894).
- "Verzeichnis der römischen Provinzen aufgesetzt um 297," *Abhandlungen der k. Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse* (Berlin, 1863).
- MONCEAUX, P. *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne depuis les origines jusqu'à l'invasion arabe*, 1 (Paris, 1901).
- MORIN, D. GERMAIN. "Le discours d'ouverture du Concile général du Latran (1179) et l'oeuvre littéraire de Maître Rufin, évêque d'Assise," *Atti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia* ser. 3, Memorie 2 (Rome, 1928), pp. 113-33.
- MÜLLER, K. "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Verfassung der alten Kirche," *Abhandlungen der Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse* (Berlin, 1922).
- "Kanon 2 und 6 von Konstantinopel, 381 und 382," in *Festgabe für A. Jülicher* (Tübingen, 1927), pp. 190-202.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- MÜLLER, K. *Kirchengeschichte*, 1 (3rd. ed., Tübingen, 1914).
- NILLES, N. *Kalendarium Manuale utriusque ecclesiae* (Innsbruck, 1896).
- OHNESORGE, W. "Die Konstantinische Schenkung, Leo III und die Anfänge der kurialen römischen Kaiseridee," *Zeitschrift der Savigny Stiftung, Germanistische Abteilung*, 68 (1951).
- ORBELI, M. "Gorod Bliznecov Διοσκουπίας i plemja Voznic, 'Ηνιόχοι," *Žurnal ministerstva narodnago prosvješćenija*, N.S. 33 (May, 1911), pp. 195-215.
- OSTROGORSKY, G. "Otnošenje cerkvi i gosudarstva v Vizantii," *Seminarium Kondakovianum*, 4 (1931), pp. 121-34; see review by F. Dölger in *BZ*, 31 (1931), pp. 449-50.
- PALANQUE, J. R. "La préfecture du Prétoire de l'Illyricum au IV^e siècle," *Byzantion*, 21 (1951), pp. 5-14.
- PANARETUS, MATTHAEUS ANGELUS. See *infra*, P. Risso.
- PAPADOPOULOS-KERAMEUS, A. Περὶ τινος συγγραφῆς Ἀρκαδίου Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κύπρου, *Vizantijskij Vremennik*, 1 (1894), pp. 601-12.
- PARGOIRE, J. *L'Eglise byzantine de 527 à 847* (2nd ed., Paris, 1923).
- "Les homélies de S. Jean Chrysostome en Juillet 399," *Echos d'Orient*, 3 (1899-1900), pp. 151-62.
- PASCHINI, P. "Note sull' origine della chiesa di Concordia," in *Memorie Storiche Forogiuliesi*, 7 (1911), pp. 9-24.
- PEETERS, P. "Les débuts du christianisme en Géorgie d'après les sources hagiographiques," *AnBoll*, 50 (1932), pp. 1-66.
- "Histoires monastiques géorgiennes," *ibid.*, 36-37 (1917-1918).
- PETERSON, E. "Einige Bemerkungen zum Hamburger Papyrusfragment der Acta Pauli," *Vigiliae Christianae*, 3 (1949), pp. 142-62.
- PETERSON, P. M. *Andrew, Brother of Simon Peter, His History and His Legends* (Leiden, 1958, Supplements to *Novum Testamentum*, 1).
- PETROVSKIJ, S. V. "Apokričeskija skazanija ob apostol'skoj propovedi po černomorskemu poberežiju," *Zapiski imp. Odesskago obščestva istorii i drevnosti*, 21 (1898), pp. 1-84.
- PICHLER, A. *Geschichte der kirchlichen Trennung*, 2 vols. (Munich, 1864-65).
- PICK, B. *The Apocryphal Acts of Paul, Peter, John, Andrew, and Thomas* (Chicago, 1909).
- PIONTEK, F. *Die katholische Kirche und die häretischen Apostelgeschichten bis zum Ausgang des 6. Jahrhunderts*. Dissertation, (Breslau, 1908);

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- also in Sdralek's *Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen*, 6 (Breslau, 1907).
- POGODIN, A. "Povest o choždenii apostola Andreja v Rusi," *Byzantinoslavica*, 7 (1937-8), pp. 137-41.
- QUISPTEL, G. "An Unknown Fragment of the Acts of Andrew (Pap. Copt. Utrecht N. 1)," *Vigiliae Christianae*, 10 (1956), pp. 129-48.
- REINACH, S. "Les apôtres chez les anthropophages," *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuse*, 9 (1904), pp. 305-20.
- RICHARD, J. "Aquilée," *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique*, 3 (Paris, 1924), cols. 113, 114.
- RISSE, P. "Matteo Angelo Panaretus e cinque suoi opuscoli," *Roma e l'Oriente*, 8 (1914).
- RÖDER, R. "Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und die romanhafte Literatur der Antike," *Würzburger Studien zur Altertumswissenschaft*, 3 (Stuttgart, 1932).
- ROETHE, G. "Zur Geschichte der römischen Synoden im 3. und 4. Jahrhundert," *Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte*, 11 (Stuttgart, 1932).
- SAINT-MARTIN, J. *Histoire d'Arménie par le patriarche Jean VI* (Paris, 1841).
- SALTET, L. "Un texte nouveau - la *Dissertatio Maximi contra Ambrosium*," *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique publié par l'Institut catholique de Toulouse*, 3^e série, 2 (1900), pp. 118-29.
- SAVIO, F. *Gli antichi vescovi d'Italia dalle origini al 1300 descritti per regioni. 1. La Lombardia* (Florence, 1913).
- SCHARF, J. "Photius und die *Epanagoge*," *BZ*, 49 (1956), pp. 385-400.
- SCHERMANN, TH. *Propheten und Apostellegenden nebst Jüngerkatalogen des Dorotheos und verwandter Texte* (Leipzig, 1907), *Texte und Untersuchungen*, 21.
- SCHMIDT, C. *Acta Pauli nach dem Papyrus der Hamburger Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek* (Hamburg-Glückstadt, 1936).
- "Apokryphe koptische Apostelgeschichten und Legenden," in Harnack's *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur*, 1 (Leipzig, 1893), pp. 919-22.
- *Die alten Petrusakten im Zusammenhang mit der apokryphen apostellitteratur* (Leipzig, 1903).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- SCHMIDT, C. *Studien zu den Pseudo-Clementinen* (Leipzig, 1929).
- SCHNITZLER, TH. "Im Kampfe um Chalkedon," *Analecta Gregoriana*, 16, sec., B, no. 7 (Rome, 1938), pp. 5-16.
- SCHÜRER, E. *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, 3 vols. (4th ed., Leipzig, 1909).
- "Die Juden im bosporanischen Reiche und die Genossenschaften der σεβόμενοι θεὸν ὑπιστοῦν," *Sitzungsberichte der königlichen Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse* (Berlin, 1897), pp. 200-25. Additional notes in *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 22 (1897), cols. 236-8, 505-7.
- SCHUSTER, A. I. *Liber sacramentorum*, 6 (Milan, 1941).
- SCHWARTZ, E. "Das Nicaenum und das Constantinopolitanum der Synode von Chalkedon," *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 24 (1925), pp. 38-88.
- "Publizistische Sammlungen zum Acacianischen Schisma," *Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Abteilung*, N. F. 10 (Munich, 1934), pp. 161-262.
- "Der sechste nicaenische Kanon auf der Synode von Chalkedon," *Sitzungsberichte der Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse* (Berlin, 1930).
- "Die sogenannte Sammlung der Kirche von Thessalonich," *Festschrift für R. Reitzenstein* (Leipzig, Berlin, 1931), pp. 137-59.
- "Zur Kirchengeschichte des vierten Jahrhunderts," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 34 (1935), pp. 129-213.
- SCHWARTZE, A. "Nordafrikanische Kirche," in Herzog-Hauck, *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, 14 (1904).
- SESTON, W. *Diocletien et la tétrarchie* (Paris, 1946).
- SHOTWELL, J. T. and LOOMIS, L. R. *The See of Peter* (New York, 1927).
- SILVA-TAROUCA, C. V. *Textus et Documenta, series theologica*, 23 (Rome, 1937).
- SIMSON, O. G. VON. *Sacred Fortress, Byzantine Art and Statecraft in Ravenna* (Chicago, 1948).
- SODEN, H. VON. *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt*, 1 (Göttingen, 1913).
- SOHM, R. *Kirchenrecht* (Munich, Leipzig, 1923).
- STEIN, A. *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Verwaltung Aegyptens unter römischer Herrschaft* (Stuttgart, 1915).
- STEIN, E. *Geschichte des spätromischen Reiches*, 1 (Vienna, 1928).
- *Histoire du bas-empire de la disparition de l'empire de l'occident à la mort de Justinien (476-565)*, 2 (Paris, Brussels, Amsterdam, 1949).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- STEIN, E. "Untersuchungen zur spätrömischen Verwaltungsgeschichte," *Rheinisches Museum*, N.F. 74 (1925), pp. 347-94.
- STREETER, H. H. *The Primitive Church* (London, 1929).
- TILLEMONT, L. S. LE NAIN DE. *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles*, 1, 5, 7, 15 (Paris, 1701-11).
- TOLSTOI, J. "Un poncif arétologique dans les miracles d'Asklepios et d'Artemios," *Byzantion*, 3 (1926), pp. 53-63.
- TURNER, C. H. *Studies in Early Church History* (Oxford, 1912).
- ULLMANN, W. *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages* (London, 1955).
- VAILHÉ, S. "Constantinople," *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, 3, cols. 1322 seq.
- "Formation du patriarcat de Jérusalem," *Echos d'Orient*, 13 (1910), pp. 325-36.
- "Origines de l'Eglise de Constantinople," *Echos d'Orient*, 10 (1907), pp. 287-95.
- VASILIEV, A. A. *Justin the First*, Dumbarton Oaks Studies, I (Cambridge, Mass., 1950).
- VASIL'EVSKIJ, V. G. "Choždenie apostola Andreja v strane Mirmidonjan," *Žurnal ministerstva narodnago prosveščenija* 189, pt. 2 (1877), pp. 41-82, 157-85.
- VAUCOURT, R. "Patriarches," in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, II.
- VERNADSKY, G. *Ancient Russia* (vol. 1 of *A History of Russia*, ed. Vernadsky, M. Karpovich) (New Haven, 1943).
- "Vizantiskija učenija o vlasti carja i patriarcha," *Sbornik statej posveščennyh pamjati N. P. Kondakova* (Prague, 1926), pp. 143-54. See review by H. F. Schmid in *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Kanonische Abteilung*, 47 (1927), pp. 530-5.
- "Die kirchlich-politische Lehre der Epanagoge und ihr Einfluss auf das russische Leben im XVII Jahrhundert," *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher*, 6 (1927), pp. 119-42.
- VOUAUX, L. *Les actes de Paul et ses lettres apocryphes* (Paris, 1913).
- *Les actes de Pierre et ses lettres apocryphes* (Paris, 1922).
- WILLE, A. *Bischof Julian von Kios des Nunzius Leos des Grossen in Konstantinopel*, Dissertation (Würzburg, 1909).
- WRIGHT, F. A. *The Works of Liutprand of Cremona* (London, 1930), p. 272.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ZAHN, TH. *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (3rd. ed., Leipzig, 1924).
——— *Das Evangelium des Lukas* (Leipzig, 1913).
——— *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, 6 (Leipzig, 1900).
ZEILLER, J. *Les origines chrétiennes dans la province romaine de Dalmatie* (Paris, 1906).
——— *Les origines chrétiennes dans les provinces danubiennes de l'empire romain* (Paris, 1918).
ZIEGLER, A. K. *Church and State in Visigothic Spain* (Washington, 1930).
ZIMMERMANN, B. "S. André," *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, I (Paris, 1907), cols. 2031-4.

INDEX

- Aaron, 146
 Abasgi, 257
 Abdias Collection, 174, 185
 Abdias, legendary Bishop of Babylon, 184
 Abraham, patriarch, 146
 Acacian schism, 88, 109, 121, 124, 153, 154, 156
 Acacius, Bishop of Ariaratheia, 78
 Acacius, Patriarch of Constantinople, 106-16, 122, 126, 129, 133
 Acci (Quadix), 33
 Achaea, 5, 6, 27, 148, 150, 159, 172, 174, 179, 182-85, 193, 195, 198, 206, 208, 211, 212, 214-20, 238
 Achaioi, tribe on shore of Sea of Pontus, 201, 219
 Acholius, Bishop of Thessalonica, 27, 57
 Acts, of Andrew, 48, 181-92, 196, 202, 203, 214, 217, 220, 221, 227, 246; of Andrew and Matthias, 174, 193, 194, 202-07, 214, 217, 262; of James, 188; of John, 18, 88, 189-92, 203, 204; of Matthew, 183; of Paul, 186-92, 196, 203; of Peter, 181, 186-92, 196, 203; of Peter and Andrew, 183, 193, 194, 199, 203, 205, 206, 214; of Thomas, 186-89, 191, 196, 203
 Adalvin, Archbishop of Salzburg, 250
 Addaeus, Doctrine of, 11
 Adhemar, papal legate, 286
 Adrian, St., 256, 258, 259
 Aegaeus (Aegeus), see Egeates
 Aetius, archdeacon, 89
 Africa, 30-35, 153, 189, 204
 Aelia Capitolina, 22
 Aeneas, Bishop of Paris, 252
 Agapetus, St., pope, 157
 Agatho, chartophylac, 167
 Agatho, St., pope, 163
 Agde, city in France, 160
 Agnellus, Church historian of Ravenna, 151, 152
 Alans, 208, 225, 257
 Alcison, Bishop of Nicopolis, 127
 Alexander, Bishop of Antioch, 13, 14, 87
 Alexander, Bishop of Constantinople, 245, 246, 257, 271
 Alexander, Christ's disciple, 205
 Alexander I, St., pope, 40
 Alexander III, pope, 285
 Alexander the Great, 60
 Alexandria, 7-13, 16-18, 20, 22, 23, 42, 47-49, 52, 53, 56, 60-70, 79, 80, 83, 87, 88, 92, 97-99, 103, 104, 107-09, 111, 112, 116, 122, 134, 135, 148, 164, 165, 168-71, 215, 230, 236, 237, 240, 243, 244, 248, 249, 266, 269, 280-87, 292, 293, 297
 Alypius, priest, 67
 Amaseia, city in Asia Minor, 185, 188, 200, 206
 Ambrose, St., Bishop of Milan, 24, 53-58, 150, 151
 Amianus, Bishop of Sirmium, 46
 Amphilochius, Bishop of Iconium, 20, 189
 Amplias, Christ's disciple, 254
 Anacletus, St., pope, 40, 283
 Anastasia, Pompey's wife, 133
 Anastasius, Bishop of Thessalonica, 26
 Anastasius I, emperor, 114, 115, 119, 124-29, 133, 135
 Anastasius II, emperor, 167
 Anastasius, librarian, 224, 277
 Anastasius I, St., pope, 26, 28
 Anastasius II, pope, 135

INDEX

- Anastos, M. V., 167, 172
 Anatolius, Bishop of Constantinople, 51, 78, 80, 84, 88-90, 94-98, 101, 104-07, 113
 Andrew, Bishop of Praevalis, 134
 Andrew, Metropolitan of Thessalonica, 124
 Andrew, St., apostle, 3, 48, 138-67, 171-86, 194-99, 205-27, 231-36, 240, 245-51, 257, 258, 262-64, 278, 281, 282, 286-92, 296, 298; stay in Byzantium, 172, 197 seq., 211 seq.; relics and churches in Italy, 149-53; relics and churches in Rome, 153, 158, 263, 264
 Andrew tradition in Syria, 261-63; in Georgia, 209-11, 262, 263; in Russia, 263, 264; in Scythia, see Scythia
 Andronicus, St., 47
 Andronicus, Camaterus, 288-90
 Anemius, bishop, 57
 Anicetus, St., pope, 40
 Annianus, St., Bishop of Alexandria, 42
 Anselm of Havelberg, 286
 Anselm of Lucca, canonist, 282, 283
Anselmo dedicata, collection of canon law, 277
 Anthropophagites (maneaters) city of the, 183, 200-07
 Antioch, 5, 8-23, 42, 44, 47, 48, 52, 54-57, 59, 62-64, 68, 69, 74, 75, 80, 81, 87, 88, 92, 96-99, 103, 108, 111, 112, 116, 122, 127, 128, 134, 136, 143, 147, 148, 163, 165, 168-71, 210, 229, 232, 236, 237, 240, 243, 244, 248, 249, 266, 269, 279, 280-89, 292, 293, 297
 Antioch in Pisidia, 20
 Anysius, Bishop of Thessalonica, 26-28
 Apollinarius, 54
 Apostolic Constitutions, 177
 Apostolicity, idea of, 4, 15, 24, 39, 46-49, 57, 59, 63, 67-71, 73, 74, 93, 109, 138, 149, 150, 154, 160, 166, 168, 170, 171, 265-67, 286, 289, 299
 Apsarus, 174, 175, 208
 Apulia-Calabria, province of Italy, 25
 Aquileia, 25, 46, 47, 54, 150, 151
 Arabia, 12, 81
 Arcadia, daughter of the Emperor Arcadius, 147
 Arcadius, Archbishop of Cyprus, 161
 Arcadius, bishop, papal legate, 65
 Arcadius, emperor, 142, 147, 154
 Argynopolis, 157, 172, 175, 204, 218, 219, 226, 256-59
 Ariens, 34, 48, 49, 52, 55, 61, 62, 67, 151, 156, 216
 Aristenus, Greek canonist, 289
 Aristotle, Greek philosopher, 201
 Arles, 36-38, 46, 71, 127
 Armenia, 12, 239, 241-43, 258, 270, 271
 Arnobius, 199
 Arrianus, 220
 Artemius, St., 227-31
 Asbestos, Bishop of Syracuse, 253
 Ashod, King of Armenia, 241
 Asia, 34, 159, 174, 198; diocese of, 5, 17, 18, 20, 83, 200, 215
 Asia Minor, 11, 12, 47, 48, 183, 196, 198-200, 206, 208, 211, 215, 221, 232, 244
 Astacos, Gulf of, 257
 Athanasius, St., Bishop of Alexandria, 49, 50, 61, 63, 67, 148, 193
 Athanasius, priest of Alexandria, 79
 Athens, 48, 242
 Atticus, Bishop of Constantinople, 17, 142, 204, 219
 Augustine, St., Bishop of Carthage, 35, 44, 46, 189
 Augustus, emperor, 32, 209
 Avitus, Bishop of Vienne, 127
 Azov, Sea of, 198
 Baanes, patrician, 268
 Babylon, 184
 Baktroi, tribe of, 209
 Balsamon, Greek canonist, 289
 Bar-Hebraeus, Syrian writer, 262
 Barlaam, monk, 294, 295
 Barnabas, St., Christ's disciple (apostle), 186, 292

INDEX

- Baronius, C., cardinal, 157, 159, 298
 Barsamya, martyrdom of, 11
 Bartholomew, St., apostle, 243
 Basil, Abbot of Greek monastery in Rome, 170
 Basil I, emperor, 228, 233, 253, 268, 270, 271, 275
 Basil II, emperor, 228, 258 [217
 Basil, Metropolitan of Seleucia, 148,
 Basil, priest, papal legate, 76
 Basil, St., Church father, 48, 58
 Basil of Achrida, 286
 Basil the Armenian, author of a list of sees, 173
Basileia, see also *Imperium*, 61, 74, 139, 140, 155, 167
Basilica, Byzantine book of law, 274
 Basiliscus, anti-emperor, 106
 Bassianus, Bishop of Lodi, 151
 Batiffol, P., 228
 Baumstark, A., 255
 Beirut, 69
 Beluchistan, 174
 Beran, J., 159
 Bethlehem, 22
 Bidez, J., 228
 Bithynia, 5, 183, 199, 200, 213-15, 257, 258
 Black Sea, 198, 200, 204, 211
 Blumenthal, M., 194
 Boeotia, 213, 214
 Boniface, priest, papal legate, 79, 89
 Boniface I, St., pope, 7, 17, 29, 37, 38, 46, 87, 88, 98
 Boniface III, pope, 283
 Bonnet, M., 226
 Bordeaux, 149
 Boris-Michael, Khagan of Bulgaria, 249, 250, 270, 271
 Bosporan Kingdom, 198, 200
 Bosporus, city of, 201; strait of, 238
 Bosphorians, 257
 Braga, 34
 Brescia, city in Italy, 150, 180, 187, 194, 208, 216
 Britton, bishop, 57
 Bruyne, Dom de, 213
 Bulgaria, 249-52
 Byzacena, 30
 Caecilian, Bishop of Carthage, 16
 Caesarea in Africa, 31
 Caesarea of Cappadocia, 17, 20, 21, 65
 Caesarea of Palestine, 22, 23
 Caesarius, Bishop of Arles, 127
 Calendia, Bishop of Antioch, 108, 109
 Callistratos, monastery of, 225, 227, 234
 Callixtus, St., pope, 41
 Camaterus, patriarch, 289
 Campania, province of Italy, 25
 Cappadocia, 5, 21, 65, 93, 199
 Caracalla, emperor, 260
 Carthage, 17, 30, 31, 34, 35, 43, 46
 Caspar, E., 32, 41, 91, 134, 137
 Caspian Sea, 209
 Cecropius, Bishop of Sebastopolis, 78
 Cedrenus, George, chronicler, 218, 260
 Celer, nobleman, 134
 Celestine, St., pope, 32, 62-66
 Cephas, Christ's disciple, 165, 176
 Ceponius, bishop, 188
 Chalcedon, 257
 Charlemagne, 248
 Cherson, 198, 221, 257, 263, 264
 Christ, 22, 40, 41, 44, 57, 115, 121-24, 126, 138, 141, 143, 145, 147, 153, 156, 163, 171, 172, 176, 177, 180, 183, 205, 213, 231, 232, 240, 241, 251, 268, 275, 277, 281, 288, 290, 291, 293-96
 Christ's disciples, list of, 157, 158, 160, 165, 175-77, 180, 208, 224, 254, 255, 258, 259, 291
Chronicon Paschale, 142, 164-66, 176-78, 218, 229, 230
Chronographeion syntomon, 237
Chronographikon syntomon, 224
 Chrysopolis, suburb of Constantinople, 204, 219
 Cilicia, 5, 11, 12
 Cirta, 31
 Clement of Alexandria, 22, 165, 166, 176, 177
 Clement, St., pope, 35, 36, 40, 43, 58, 221
 Clermont Ferrand, city in France, 160

INDEX

- Cletus, St., pope, 43
 Coele, Syria, 12
 Colchis, 174, 210, 225
Collectio Vallicelliana, canon law, 278
Collection of Nine Books, canon law, 278
 Comana, city of Asia Minor, 154
 Concordia, city in Lombardy, 150, 151
 Constantine, deacon, 164
 Constantine I, the Great, emperor, 24, 36, 139, 140, 149, 154, 155, 157, 227, 228, 230, 238, 243, 245, 255, 259, 293, 295, 296
 Constantine IV, emperor, 163
 Constantine V (Copronymus), emperor, 225
 Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus, emperor, 167
 Constantine IX Monomachus, emperor, 280
 Constantine I, pope, 167
 Constantine-Cyril, St., Apostle of the Slavs, 209, 221
 Constantinople (Byzantium), *passim*; apostolic origin of, 139, 158, 160-62, 164, 166, 167, 169, 170, 235, 236, 238, 244, 245, 249-52, 267, 269, 275, 276, 279, 286, 290, 292, 296, 298; churches of: Hagia Sophia, 62, 106, 107, 154, 167, 230, 254, Holy Apostles, 3, 67, 137-41, 144-46, 154-56, 159, 162, 227, 228, Holy Mother of God on the Acropolis, 226, 234, 257, Oxeia, 229, St. George, 259; lists of bishops of, 237, 238, 260, 261; *Menologion* of, 178; New Rome, 3, 60, 80-82, 152, 166, 167, 170, 231, 236, 240, 249, 269, 283; primacy of, 248-50, 287-89
 Constantius, emperor, 61, 139, 140, 154, 227, 228, 243
 Corinth, 5, 6, 48, 212, 215
 Cornelius, centurion, 292
Corpus of the apocryphal Acts of the apostles, 186-91, 196
 Corsica, 25
 Corssen, P., 213
 Councils (see also synods), oecumenical: of Nicea (325), 6-29, 37, 38, 49, 84-90, 93, 97, 99, 101-04, 108, 113, 136, 244, 245, 269, 271; of Constantinople (381), 11, 18-22, 26, 50-56, 62, 83, 87-90, 96, 131, 136, 252, 267, 277, 283, 289; of Ephesus (431), 60, 62-68, 72; of Chalcedon (451), 8, 21, 51, 69-71, 75, 78-85, 88, 91-93, 96, 100-05, 108-11, 113, 118, 120, 122, 125, 127, 128, 131, 134-36, 150, 277, 286, 287, 289; Third of Constantinople (680-681), 21, 162-64, 266; in Trullo (692), 102, 284; Second of Nicaea (787), 170, 171, 235, 255; Ignatian (869-870), 163, 268-71, 277, 284; Photian (879-880), 233, 234; Third of Lateran (1179), 284, 285; Fourth of Lateran, (1215), 297; of Florence (1439), 296-98
 Crescentius, St. Peter's disciple, 34
 Crete, 27
 Crimea, 198, 206, 208-10, 216, 221
 Cumont, F., 198, 199
 Cyprian, St., Bishop of Carthage, 30-32, 35, 43, 44
 Cyprus, 22, 43, 291
 Cyriacus, Patriarch of Constantinople, 161
 Cyril, St., Bishop of Alexandria, 62-67, 78
 Cyril, St., Bishop of Jerusalem, 56, 146
 Dacia, 25-27
 Damasus, St., pope, 26-28, 34, 45, 48, 52, 55-58, 86, 216, 278, 283
 Daniel, Bishop of Cadena, 78
 Daniel, prophet, 146
 Danube, river, 257
 Dardania, 27, 109, 111-14, 116, 117, 122
 Darius, Persian king, 174
 Darrouzès, J., 242
 Decius, emperor, 31
Decretum Gelasianum, 56, 88, 252, 285
Decretum Gratiani, collection of canon law, 283

INDEX

- Delehaye, H., 255, 258
 Der Nersessian, S., 239, 242
 Deusdedit, cardinal, 238, 283
 Diocletian, Roman emperor, 9, 12, 24, 30, 31, 156, 201, 237, 298
 Diodorus, Bishop of Tarsus, 20
 Diogenes, Bishop of Cyzicus, 88
 Dionysius Barçalibi, Syrian writer, 262
 Dionysius Exiguus, canonist, 121
 Dioscorus, papal legate, 130
 Dioscorus, Patriarch of Alexandria, 68-70, 72, 76-79, 90, 91, 94, 99, 101, 118, 136, 148
 Dioscurias, Greek colony of, 210
 Dnieper, river, 263
 Dobrudža, 201
 Dölger, F., 233, 245, 247, 252, 253, 273, 288
 Dometius, Bishop of Byzantium, 256, 258, 261
 Dominicans in Constantinople, 291
 Dominicus, Archbishop of Grado (Aquileia), 281, 285
 Domitian, Bishop of Melitene, 162
 Domnus, Bishop of Antioch, 69, 75
Donatio Constantini, 252, 280, 288, 289, 293-97
 Dorotheus, Bishop of Tyre (see also Pseudo-Dorotheus), 156-58, 164, 178, 179, 237, 298
 Dorotheus, Metropolitan of Thessalonica, 124, 127, 134
 Dorotheus, priest of Antioch, 156
 Dorylaeum, 73
 Duchesne, L., 31

 Edessa, 11, 69
 Egeates (Aegeates, Aegeus), Proconsul of Achaea, 174, 212
 Egypt (Egyptians), 7-11, 18-20, 30, 48, 51, 52, 60-63, 70, 99, 104, 134, 135, 146, 174, 176, 187, 193, 202-04, 214
 Eleusios, George, hagiographer, 161
 Eleutherus, St., pope, 41
 Elias, Patriarch of Jerusalem, 268
 Emilia, province of Italy, 24
 Encratite tendency, 191, 192

Epanagoge, 271-75
 Ephesus, 5, 6, 17, 20, 21, 47, 107, 136, 215, 243-45, 293
 Ephrem, chronographer, 296
 Ephrem, St., 240
 Epiphanius, Bishop of Cyprus (see also Pseudo-Epiphanius), 22, 43, 173, 175-78, 187, 225
 Epiphanius, monk, 175, 179, 180, 194, 207, 210, 225-27, 257, 263
 Epiphanius, Patriarch of Constantinople, 130, 132, 133, 158
 Epirus, 27, 172, 216
Epitome legum, Byzantine book of law, 274
 Erythrean Sea, 174
 Esquiline, church of St. Andrew on the, 153
 Ethiopia (Ethiopians), 174, 175, 193, 204, 209, 225
 Eucherius, Bishop of Lyon, 216
 Eudoxia, empress, 73, 154
 Euodius, Bishop of Antioch, 15, 42
 Euphemia, empress, 134
 Euphemius, Bishop of Constantinople, 110
 Eusebius, Bishop of Dorylaeum, 73, 89, 90
 Eusebius, Church historian, 15, 22, 42, 48, 156, 165, 176, 177, 179, 180, 186-88, 197, 211, 212, 217, 218
 Eusebius of Vercelli, 45
 Euthymius, St., 275
 Eutyches, heretic, 78
 Eutychius, St., Patriarch of Constantinople, 161, 162
 Evaristus, St., pope, 40
 Evodius, Bishop of Uzala, 189

 Faustus, magister, 114
 Felix, Bishop of Acci, 33
 Felix I, St., pope, 65
 Felix II (III), St., pope, 109-11, 116, 118, 121, 129
Filioque, 286
 Finns, 201
 Firmus, Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, 65

INDEX

- Flaminia, province of Italy, 24
 Flaminia-Picenum, province of Italy, 25
 Flamion, J., 173, 179, 189, 192, 193, 195, 202-04, 214, 215, 233
 Flavian, Bishop of Antioch, 54, 56, 59
 Flavian, St., Bishop of Constantinople, 68-73, 77, 79, 80, 88, 118, 148, 155, 156
 Flavianus, Bishop of Philippi, 65
 Flavita (Phrabitus), Bishop of Constantinople, 110
 Fondi, city in Italy, 149, 151
 Francion, Metropolitan of Philippopolis, 78

 Galata, 259
 Galatia, 5, 199
 Galla Placidia, empress, 73-75, 81, 85
 Gallaecia, province of Spain, 32
 Gallus, brother of the Emperor Julian, 227
 Garitte, G., 241
 Gaudentius of Brescia, 150, 216
 Gaul (Gallia), 36-38, 43, 46, 58, 153
 Gelasius, St., pope, 56, 88, 109-22, 126, 134, 136, 153
 Gelasius of Cyzicus, 256, 257
 George I, Patriarch of Constantinople, 163
 George Syncellus, chronicler, 218
 George the Monk, chronicler, 190, 224
 Georgia (Georgians), 209-11, 262-64
 Gerland, E., 21
 Germanus II, patriarch, 291
 Gnostics, 187, 191, 192, 195, 196
 Gordian, emperor, 260
 Gordillo, M., 253
 Gorsinians, 174, 175, 209, 211
 Gothia, 215, 216
 Goths, 151, 216
 Grado, 281, 282
 Gratian, canonist, 283, 284, 297
 Gratian, emperor, 25, 45
 Greece (Greeks), 47, 48, 146, 148, 149, 188, 194, 195, 198, 204-06, 208, 213-15, 220-221, 239-42, 250-52, 258, 288, 296, 297
 Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa, 20
 Gregory, St., Bishop of Tours, 160, 182-89, 192-95, 199, 201, 202, 205, 206, 217, 222, 282
 Gregory of Nazianzus, St., 27, 52, 54, 62, 146, 216
 Gregory VII, St., pope, 282
 Gregory the Great, St., pope, 15, 35, 158-60, 250
 Grumel, V., 172, 241
 Gutschmid, A. von, 209

 Hadrametum, 31
 Hadrian I, pope, 171
 Hadrian II, pope, 221, 252, 270
 Hadrian IV, pope, 286
 Haller, J., 30, 137
 Harnack, A. von, 41, 192, 197-99
 Heard, R. G., 213
 Hegesippus, 41
 Helladius, Bishop of Caesarea, 20
 Hellas, 172, 177, 179, 216, 217
 Hellespont, 185
 Heniochi, tribe on shores of Sea of Pontus, 201
 Hennecke, E., 194, 219
Henoticon, 108, 125, 135
 Heracleia, 17, 20, 21, 50, 112, 113, 226, 261
 Heraclius, emperor, 161, 162, 164
 Hergenröther, J., 289
 Hermagoras of Aquileia, 47
 Herodotus, historian, 174, 202
 Hesychius of Jerusalem, 204, 246
 Hesychius of Miletus, 218
 Hilarion, Metropolitan of Kiev, 264
 Hilarius, Bishop of Arles, 37, 71
 Hilarius, Bishop of Narbonne, 37
 Himerius, Bishop of Tarragona, 34
 Hincmar, Archbishop of Reims, 250, 251
 Hippolytus, St., 41, 58
 Holy Ghost, 86-88, 261, 268, 287
 Honig, R., 29
 Honorius, emperor, 29
 Hormisdas, pope, 124-33, 137, 154
 Humbert, cardinal, 279-82, 288
 Huns, 47
 Hydacius, bishop, 188
 Hyginus, St., pope, 40

INDEX

- Hypotyposis*, work of Clement of Alexandria, 165, 176, 177
 Hyssus, Bay of, 174
- Iaxartes, river, 209
 Ibas, bishop, 69
 Iberia (Iberians), 209, 210, 225, 234
 Iconium, 20
 Iconoclasm (iconoclasts), 167, 171, 173, 180, 225, 230, 255, 271, 272, 276
 Ignatius, St., Bishop of Antioch, 5, 15, 45, 147
 Ignatius, Patriarch of Constantinople, 231, 238, 239, 243, 245, 252, 255, 268, 270, 276
 Ignatius the Deacon, hagiographer, 235
 Illyricum, 25-30, 46-48, 51, 87, 96, 100, 116, 122, 123, 125, 126, 172, 211
 Imperial cult, 5, 8
Imperium (see also *Basileia*), 71, 241, 266, 272
 India (Indians), 159, 209, 211, 215
 Innocent I, St., pope, 8, 13, 14, 17, 26, 28, 34, 46, 87, 98, 188
 Innocent III, pope, 290
 Irenaeus, St., Bishop of Lyon, 36, 40, 41
 Irene, St., empress, 235
 Isauria, 12
 Ischyrion, deacon of Alexandria, 79
 Italy, 5, 10, 23-25, 30, 39, 54, 58, 72, 74, 84, 86, 153
- James, M.R., 194
 James, St., apostle, 22, 36, 42, 48, 144, 215, 240, 247, 250, 286
 Jeremiah, prophet, 146
 Jerome, St., 14, 22, 23, 42, 44, 45, 49, 142, 214, 217
 Jerusalem, 11, 21-23, 42, 47-49, 56, 57, 63, 64, 66, 68, 80, 81, 92, 96, 147, 163, 168-71, 211, 215, 236, 237, 240, 247, 249, 257, 266, 268, 269, 281, 285-88, 290, 292
 Jews (Israel), 4, 8, 9, 198, 199, 207, 213, 239, 241
- John, St., apostle, 22, 136, 144, 146, 150, 158, 181, 186-88, 196, 197, 200, 211, 215, 216, 238-40, 243-45, 250, 286, 293
 John, Bishop of Antioch, 63, 64, 66, 147
 John, St., Bishop of Gothia, 271
 John, Bishop of Jerusalem, 14, 22, 23, 49
 John, Bishop of Nicopolis, 126, 127
 John, brother of Nicholas Mesarites, 290, 291
 John VI, Catholicos of Armenia, 242, 243
 John II, Patriarch of Constantinople, 129-31, 136, 137
 John IV, St., Patriarch of Constantinople, 161
 John VI, Patriarch of Constantinople, 167
 John I, St., pope, 157
 John VIII, pope, 233, 277
 John Chrysostom, St., bishop, 59, 60, 62, 93, 118, 140-46, 154-56
 John Cubicularius, 267
 John of Damascus, St., 168
 John of Rhodes, 227-30
 John of Thessalonica, 190
 John Philoponus, 135, 136, 244
 John Scholasticos, Bishop of Constantinople, 16, 161
 John the Baptist, St., 150, 243, 250
 John the Deacon, biographer of St. Gregory the Great, 159
 Joseph, St., Old Testament patriarch, 146, 203
 Judaea, 142, 158
 Judas, 43
 Jude, St., 35, 240
 Jugie, M., 60, 92, 233
 Julian, Bishop of Kios, 100-02
 Julian, emperor, 156, 178, 227-30, 298
 Juliana Anicia, 133
 Julius, papal legate, 68
 Julius, I, St., pope, 55, 65
 Justin I, emperor, 129, 130
 Justinian I, emperor, 29, 91, 92, 129-31, 137, 151, 152, 266, 267, 271, 272, 275, 277, 280, 281, 295

INDEX

- Justiniana Prima, 29
 Juvenal, Bishop of Jerusalem, 65, 66, 81, 103
 Khazars, 209
 Kiev, 263, 264
 Lagrange, M. J., 213
 Langen, J., 28
 Laodicea, 20
Latrocinium, see Synod of Ephesus (449)
 Latyšev, B., 258
Laudatio, Life of St. Andrew, 195, 207, 226, 227, 231, 232-35, 257, 263
 Laurent, J., 241
 Lazi, Caucasian tribe, 257
 Leo I, Byzantine emperor, 104, 109, 113
 Leo III, emperor, 172
 Leo V, emperor, 167, 180, 225
 Leo VI, emperor, 278
 Leo I, the Great, St., pope, 26, 37, 51, 68, 70-74, 76-80, 85-95, 97-104, 106, 108-11, 113, 120, 121, 134, 136, 188, 252, 286, 292
 Leo II, St., pope, 163
 Leo III, St., pope, 248
 Leo the Sacellarius, 169
 Leonides, philosopher, 188
 Lesbius, proconsul, 212
 Leucius, author of the Acts of John, 188-90, 196
Libellus Hormisdæ, 125, 126, 129, 130, 134
 Liberius, St., pope, 45, 50
 Libya, 8, 10, 30
 Licinius, emperor, 156, 256, 296
 Liguria, 24
 Linus, St., pope, 40, 42, 43, 290
 Lipsius, R. A., 173, 191-93, 195, 219, 226
 Liutprand of Cremona, 278, 288
 Lodi, city in Lombardy, 151
 Lombardy, 150, 151
 Louis II, emperor, 248
 Lübeck, K., 10, 12 [25
 Lucania-Bruttium, province of Italy,
- Lucentius, bishop, papal legate, 76, 96
 Luke, St., evangelist, 138-40, 142, 149-51, 212-16, 231, 240, 243, 261
 Lyon, 36, 41
 Macarius Ancyranus, 295
 Macarius Magnes, 201
 Macedonia (Macedonians), 5, 6, 25-27, 48, 123, 172, 179, 183, 185, 211, 215, 216, 218, 221, 226, 238, 296
 Macedonius I, Bishop of Constantinople, 156
 Macedonius II, Bishop of Constantinople, 127
 Mai, cardinal, 239
 Malalas, chronicler, 189, 190, 218
 Manichaeans, 187, 189, 191, 196
 Manuel I Comnenus, emperor, 285, 288, 289
 Marcian, emperor, 72, 76, 77, 84, 94, 98, 101, 104, 113
 Marcianopolis, 20
 Marcion, heretic, 43, 201, 213
 Mark, St., evangelist, 35, 47, 49, 62, 67-69, 97, 99, 107, 109, 111, 135, 136, 148, 163, 215, 236, 240, 243, 281, 292
 Marmarius, Bishop of Marcianopolis, 20
Martyrium Matthæi, 174, 205
 Matthias, St., apostle, 43, 176, 183, 184, 186, 201, 202, 204, 205
 Matthew, St., apostle, evangelist, 143, 174, 205, 240, 243
 Matthew Angelus Panaretus, 295
 Matthew Blastares, 274
 Matthew Caryphylus, 295
 Mauretania Caesariensis, 30, 31
 Mauretania Sitifensis, 30, 31
 Mauretania Tingitana, 30, 31
 Maurikios, emperor, 161
 Maurus, Bishop of Ravenna, 152
 Maximian, Bishop of Ravenna, 151, 152
 Maximian, emperor, 24
 Maximus, Bishop of Antioch, 80, 98, 99, 103

INDEX

- Maximus the Confessor, St., 267
 Maximus the Cynic, 27, 52-54
 Meletius, Bishop of Antioch, 52, 54
 Meletius, Bishop of Lycopolis, 6, 7
 Melitene, 20, 162
 Memnon, Bishop of Ephesus, 66
 Menas, Patriarch of Constantinople, 158
Menologion, published by B. Latyšev, 258
Menologion of Basil II, 228, 231
 Mesarites, see Nicholas Mesarites
 Methodius, St., Apostle of the Slavs, 221
 Metrophanes, St., Bishop of Constantinople, 156-58, 164, 165, 224, 237, 238, 245, 246, 255-57, 260, 261, 271
 Metrophanes, Bishop of Smyrna, 268
 Michael II, emperor, 173
 Michael III, emperor, 190, 221, 248, 249
 Michael III of Anchialus, patriarch, 288, 289, 294
 Michael Caerularius, Patriarch of Constantinople, 279, 280
 Michael the Syrian, historian, 135, 262
 Misenus, papal legate, 121
 Milan, 24, 25, 36, 56, 58, 65, 86, 112, 150, 151, 283, 292
 Mithridates, King of Pontus, 200
 Moesia, 27
 Monophysitism, 106-08, 134, 135, 244
 Montfaucon, B. de, 142
 Mordwa, Finnish tribe, 201
 Mosaic precepts, 5, 74
 Moses of Chorene, 210
 Müller, K., 10, 12, 13, 92
 Muratori's Fragment (canon), 35, 200, 213
 Myrmekion, city of, 202, 205
 Myrmidon (Mirmidonia, Myrna), city of the anthropophagites, 184, 201, 202, 205, 206
 Narbonensis Prima, Secunda, 36, 37
 Narcissus, St., 259
Narratio (Martyrium S. Apostoli Andreae), 171-75, 179, 180, 206, 207, 218, 226
 Nectarius, Bishop of Constantinople, 20, 54, 55
 Neoplatonism, 192-94
 Neopythagorism, 192, 193
 Nero, Roman emperor, 211
 Nestorianism, 69
 Nestorius, Bishop of Constantinople, 62-64, 126
 Neuville-le-Roi, city in France, 160
 Nexocharides, philosopher, 188
 Nicaea, 175, 185, 200, 215, 262
 Nicephorus I, emperor, 200
 Nicephorus II, emperor, 167
 Nicephorus, St., Patriarch of Constantinople, 173, 224, 235-37
 Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopoulos, 203, 205, 219, 259, 260, 295, 296
 Nicetas of Nicomedia, 286
 Nicetas Pectoratus, monk, 286
 Nicetas Seides, 288
 Nicetas the Paphlagonian, 234
 Nicetas the Philosopher, 210
 Nicholas I, St., pope, 248-51, 276, 277
 Nicholas II, pope, 283
 Nicholas Mesarites, 290, 291, 293
 Nicholas Mysticus, patriarch, 278
 Nicomedia, city in Asia Minor, 185, 200, 215, 262
 Nicopolis, 126, 127
 Nikon, Russian monk, 264
 Nile, river, 204
 Nilus, Cabasilas, 295
 Nilus Doxopates, 287, 288
 Nina, St., 211
 Nola, city in Italy, 149, 151
Nomocanon of Fourteen Titles, 16
 Novgorod, 263, 264
 Numerianus, emperor, 260
 Numidia, 30, 31, 35
 Nyssa, 20
 Octavian, Roman emperor, 8
 Ohnesorge, W., 297
 Ombria, province of Italy, 25
 Optatus Milevitanus, 44
 Optimus, Bishop of Antioch in Pisia, 20

INDEX

- Orient, diocese of, 9-14, 17, 18, 20,
 23, 51, 55
 Origen, 197-99, 211, 212, 214
 Otreius, Bishop of Melitene, 20
 Otto II, emperor, 278
 Oxus, river, 209
- Pacianus, Bishop of Barcelona, 191
 Palestine, 11, 22, 23, 81, 101, 103, 197
 Palladius of Ratiaria, 45
 Pammachius, 22
 Pannonia, 25
 Pantaleemon, deacon, 291
 Panticapaeum, city of Cherson, 198,
 202
 Paphlagonia, 200, 206, 211
 Paricanii, tribe on coast of Erythrean
 Sea, 174
 Parthians (Parthia), 199, 200
 Paschasinus, bishop, papal legate,
 76-78, 84, 88, 91, 136
 Patras, 48, 150, 167, 174, 177, 185,
 208, 211, 212, 214, 219, 220, 226,
 227, 279, 293
 Patroclus, Bishop of Arles, 37
 Paul, St., apostle, 5, 35, 36, 40-42, 48
 74, 75, 97, 123, 124, 128, 138,
 140-45, 149, 158, 159, 172, 175,
 177, 181, 186, 187, 211, 212, 214,
 235, 240, 244, 249, 250, 288, 291
 Paul, archpriest, hagiographer, 210
 Paul, St., Bishop of Constantinople,
 155, 156
 Paul, Bishop of Ephesus, 107
 Paul of Samosata, 11, 290
 Paulinus, Bishop of Antioch, 52-54,
 56
 Paulinus, Bishop of Nola, 149
 Pelagius, pope, 159
 Peloponnese, 226
 Pentarchy, 163, 168, 235-37, 266,
 267, 275-77, 281, 283, 285, 287,
 290, 291
 Perinthus, city on Thracian coast,
 185
 Persia, 12
 Peter, Bishop of Apamia, 128
 Peter, Bishop of Oxyrhynchus, 53
 Peter, Metropolitan of Gangrae, 78
- Peter, Patriarch of Antioch, 279, 285
 Peter II, Bishop of Alexandria, 52,
 53, 61
 Peter II, Bishop of Ravenna, 151
 Peter, Simon, St., apostle, 3, 4, 15,
 22, 24, 34-37, 39-46, 56, 58-60,
 62, 66, 68-76, 81, 85, 93, 97-99,
 103, 109, 111, 115, 117, 121-24,
 126, 128, 130-32, 135, 136, 138,
 140, 141, 143-45, 147-49, 152-54,
 158, 159, 163, 165, 170, 174, 177,
 181-83, 186, 187, 199, 200, 205,
 211, 221, 231-33, 235, 236, 244,
 246-51, 254, 275, 279, 281, 287,
 288, 290, 292, 294, 295
 Peter Damian, St., 281, 282
 Peter Fuller, Bishop of Antioch, 109,
 110, 115
 Peter Mongus, Bishop of Alexandria,
 108, 109, 116
 Peter the Iberian, St., 210
 Peterson, P.M., 195, 203, 204
 Petrine principle (tradition), 98, 99,
 111, 116, 134, 248, 249, 252,
 278-82, 286, 288-91, 296
 Petrus Chrysologus, Bishop of Ra-
 venna, 151, 204
 Phasis, river, 174, 175, 208
 Philadelphus, Bishop of Byzantium,
 260
 Philastrius, Bishop of Brescia, 180,
 187, 188, 194, 208
 Philip, St., apostle, 146
 Philip, priest, papal legate, 65, 66
 Philippi, Greek city, 48, 185
 Philostorgius, Church historian, 227-
 29
- Phocas, emperor, 161, 283
 Phoenicia, 81
 Photius, Patriarch of Constanti-
 nople, 136, 157, 190, 191, 196, 231,
 233, 234, 239, 241-48, 252, 253,
 255-57, 268, 270, 272-76, 293, 298
 Phoullae, city in Crimea, 208
 Phoustes, 225
 Phrygia, 199, 215
 Pick, B., 194
 Pisidia, 20
 Pius I, St., pope, 40

INDEX

- Placidia, see Galla Placidia
 Pliny the Younger, 204, 220
 Pompey, a relative of the Emperor Anastasius, 133
 Pontus, 5, 199, 200, 220; diocese of, 17, 18, 20, 83, 93, 96, 188, 194, 206, 208, 215, 217, 238; Sea of, 157, 172, 174, 201, 205, 208, 234, 257, 258
 Portugal, 32
 Praevalitana, 27
 Prisca, oldest collection of Roman canon law, 17
 Priscillianists, 187
 Probus, Bishop of Canusa, 109, 113
 Probus, emperor, 256
Procheiron, 271
 Proclus, Patriarch of Constantinople, 147, 154
 Procopius, priest of Constantinople, 157
 Proiectus, bishop, papal legate, 65
 Prologues to the Gospels, 213, 214
 Propontis, 257
 Proterius, Bishop of Alexandria, 99, 104
 Pseudo-Athanasius, see Basil of Se-leucia
 Pseudo-Chrysostom, 216
 Pseudo-Clementine Homilies, 43
 Pseudo-Dorotheus, 156, 164-66, 173, 179, 180, 223, 224, 226, 237, 255, 256, 258-62, 295, 296
 Pseudo-Epiphanius, 175, 176, 178, 179, 208, 209, 211, 224, 226, 262
 Pseudo-Hipolytus, 224, 258
 Pseudo-Marcellus, 190
 Pseudo-Mellitus, 188
 Pseudo-Symeon, chronicler, 260, 261
 Ptolemy, geographer, 204
 Ptolemy Philadelphus, 241
 Pulcheria, empress, 71-74, 81, 90, 96, 100, 154, 155
 Pyrrhus, heretic, 267
 Quispel, G., 195
 Ratramus, Abbot of Corbie, 251, 252
 Ravenna, 25, 87, 112, 151, 152, 217
 Rekkared, king, 34
 Renus, Bishop of Ionopolis, 78
 Rhaetia, 25
 Rhossos in Cilicia, 11
 Roger, King of Sicily, 287
 Roman Empire, 4-6, 8, 11, 17, 19, 20, 22, 25, 29, 30, 32, 36, 39, 47, 48, 50, 51, 53, 56, 67, 74, 75, 81-85, 87, 91, 103, 121, 145, 236, 248, 251, 275, 299
 Roman Senate, 32, 212
 Rome, *passim*; appeal to Rome, 31, 32, 72, 73, 118, 252, 253, 276, 278; Old Rome, 60, 81, 162, 163, 166, 169-71, 236, 269, 270; Eternal City, 71, 74; Imperial City, 59, 80, 82, 83, 140, 145, 149
 Roman see, *passim*; apostolic see, 45, 46, 50, 57-59, 65-67, 70-79, 93-95, 99-111, 113, 115, 117, 118, 121, 122, 126, 129, 132-35, 137, 154, 162, 167, 168, 170, 171, 239, 283; oecumenical see, 163, 166, 287; primacy of Roman see, 70, 75, 81, 84, 92-94, 103, 107, 109, 117, 119, 123, 125, 128, 135, 160, 233, 248, 250, 252, 253, 277, 282, 285, 288-91, 293-98
 Romulus, 149
 Rouen, 150
 Rufinus, Bishop of Byzantium, 260
 Rufinus, translator of Eusebius' History, 43, 186, 197
 Rufinus Magister, Bishop of Assise, 284, 285
 Rufus, Bishop of Thessalonica, 27-29
 Rufus, Christ's disciple, 205
 Russia, 198, 263, 264
 Sabas, monk of Callistratos, 234
 Sabazius, cult of, 199
Sacerdotium, 155, 266, 272
Sacramentarium Leonianum, 152
 Sakai, tribe of, 209
 Salofaciol, Bishop of Alexandria, 107
 Salomon of Basrah, Syrian writer, 262
 Salona, 47
 Samnium, province of Italy, 25

INDEX

- Samosata, 11
 Samuel, prophet, 142
 Sardinia, 25, 182
 Sarmatians, 198
 Sauromatai, 234
 Scharf, J., 274
 Schermann, Th., 173
 Schürer, E., 198, 199
 Schwartz, E., 16, 17, 26, 90, 91
 Scythia (Little Scythia) province
 bordering Illyricum, 125, 201
 Scythia (Scythians), 174, 175, 198-
 202, 205-09, 211, 216, 217, 219,
 220, 234, 262
 Sebastopolis, 174, 208-10, 263
 Seleucus, Metropolitan of Amasia, 78
 Serapion, Bishop of Antioch, 11
 Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople,
 161, 162
 Sesostris, Egyptian king, 174
 Setif, 31
 Severus, emperor, 218
 Severus, Patriarch of Antioch, 127,
 128
 Sevilla, 34
 Sicily, 25, 287
 Sicyon, 218
 Simon the Cananean, Christ's dis-
 ciple, 35, 210
 Simplicius, St., pope, 106-09, 111,
 153
 Sinope, city in Asia Minor, 175, 179,
 185, 188, 200, 206, 207, 210, 211,
 225, 257, 263, 264
 Siricius, notary, 65
 Siricius, St., pope, 26, 27, 34, 45
 Sirmium, 46, 47, 112
 Sixtus I, St., pope, 40
 Skyles, Scythian king, 202
 Slavs, 167
 Socrates, Church historian, 45, 93,
 139, 155, 156, 164, 165, 204, 219,
 237, 238
 Soden, H. von, 214
 Sofala in Africa, 204
 Sogdians (Sogdianoi), 174, 208, 209
 Sohm, R., 10, 12
 Sophronius, layman of Alexandria,
 79
 Sosthenes, Christ's disciple, 176
 Soter, St., pope, 41
 Soussians, Caucasian tribe, 225
 Sozomen, Church historian, 49, 55,
 155, 156
 Spain (Spanish Church), 30-36, 43, 46
 Stachys, Christ's disciple, 157, 164,
 165, 171, 172, 175, 177-80, 223,
 224, 226, 234, 237, 244-46, 254-59,
 262, 264, 296, 298
 Stephen, Bishop of Antioch, 108
 Strabo, geographer, 201, 202, 220
 Studios, monastery of, 234
 Sugdaea, city in the Crimea, 208
 Sugdaeans, 209
 Sylvester I, St., pope, 293
 Symeon, Patriarch of Jerusalem, 286
 Symeon Metaphrastes, hagiogra-
 pher, 211, 228, 257, 258, 287
 Symeon of the Marvelous Mountain,
 St., 161
 Symeon the Logothete, 259
 Symeon the Stylite, St., 127
 Symmachus, St., pope, 122, 123, 126,
 128, 134, 136, 153
 Synaxaries, 217, 254-58, 263
 Synods: of Ancyra (314), 12; of An-
 tioch (341), 7; of Aquileia (381),
 45, 46, 53, 54; of Carthage (418),
 16, 31, 32; of Constantinople (382),
 57; of Constantinople (861), 238,
 239, 243, 253, 270, 276; of Con-
 stantinople (867), 252, 253, 276;
 of Elvira, 32; of Ephesus (449),
 (*Latrocinium*, or "Robber" Sy-
 nod), 67, 68, 70, 72-75, 83, 89, 91,
 155; iconoclastic, 171, 236; of
 Mileve, 46; of Neocaesarea, 12;
 of the Oak (403), 62, 83; Roman
 (382), 56, 57, 88; Roman (495),
 121; Roman (863), 276; of Sardica
 (343), 45, 114, 252, 276; of Turin,
 36
Synopsis Basilicorum, Byzantine
 book of law, 274
Synopsis minor, Byzantine book of
 law, 274
Syntagma, Byzantine book of canon
 law, 274

INDEX

- Syntagma* of Fourteen Titles, 82, 102
 Syria (Syrians), 5, 9, 11-14, 55, 127, 176, 177, 180, 210, 261, 262
 Taman peninsula, 263
 Tarasius, St., Patriarch of Constantinople, 170, 171, 235
 Tarraconensis, province of Spain, 32
 Tarragona, 34
 Tarsus, 20
 Tauroi, 234
 Terennius, Bishop of Scythia, 20
 Tertullian, 35, 41-43, 59, 199, 201, 204
 Thaddaeus, St., apostle, 243
 Thalassius, Archimandrite of Constantinople, 110
 Thalassius, Exarch of Pontus, 96
 Thebaid, 6, 10
 Theodore, Bishop of Claudiopolis, 80
 Theodore, deacon, 164
 Theodore, deacon of Alexandria, 79
 Theodore, St. (d. 613), 161
 Theodore of Studios, St., 168-71, 235, 267
 Theodore, Santabareus, 234
 Theodore the Lector, 127, 142
 Theodoret, Bishop of Kyrros (Cyrus) in Syria, 74, 203, 216
 Theodoret, Church historian, 55, 75, 148, 189, 230
 Theodorich, King of the Goths, 151
 Theodorus, Bishop of Lignidum, 134
 Theodosius, author of *De Situ Terrae Sanctae*, 206
 Theodosius I, emperor, 20, 25, 51, 54, 55, 62, 82, 94, 155
 Theodosius II, emperor, 29, 30, 69, 71-74, 81, 154
 Theodotus, Byzantine heretic, 261
 Theophanes, St., chronicler, 157, 162, 179, 224, 229, 230, 237
 Theophanes, Patriarch of Antioch, 163
 Theophanes "Cerameus," 203, 286, 287
 Theophilus, Bishop of Alexandria, 22, 49, 62
 Thessalia (Thessaly), 27, 29, 172, 179
 Thessalonica, 5, 6, 26-28, 48, 51, 52, 122, 185, 189, 190, 195, 215, 295
 Thomas, St., apostle, 146, 150, 151, 159, 186, 189, 197, 211, 215, 246
 Thomas, Bishop of Theodosiopolis, 78
 Thomas, Patriarch of Jerusalem, 168
 Thomas I, Patriarch of Constantinople, 161
 Thomas Morosini, Latin Patriarch of Constantinople, 290
 Thrace, diocese of, 17, 19-21, 83, 93, 126, 151, 157, 174, 175, 185, 188, 197, 201, 208, 211, 214-17, 220, 221, 226, 238, 259, 296
 Thrasamond, Vandal King, 183
 Tillemont, L.N. de, 90, 93, 256
 Timotheus of Constantinople, 180
 Timothy, Bishop of Alexandria, 20, 53, 62, 115
 Timothy, Bishop of Constantinople, 127
 Timothy, St., St. Paul's disciple, 138-40, 142-45, 151, 231
 Timothy Aelurus, Bishop of Alexandria, 104, 107, 134
 Titus, Bishop of Byzantium, 258, 261
 Tmutorakan, 263, 264
 Toledo, 34
 Toscana, province of Italy, 24
 Toulouse, 188
 Trajan, emperor, 221
 Trèves, 36, 112
 Tripolis, 31
 Tripolitana, 30, 31
 Trophimus, St., Bishop of Arles, 37, 46
 Turin, 36
Typicon of Constantinople, 230, 254-56
 Tyre, 69, 156, 298
 Urbanus, Christ's disciple, 254, 259
 Valeria, province of Italy, 25
 Valeria Byzacena, 30, 31
 Valerian, bishop, 57
 Valerian, emperor, 290
 Valentinian III, emperor, 71, 73, 85
 Vandals, 35

INDEX

- Varangians, 263
- Varianus (Virinus), proconsul, 195
- Venantius, Fortunatus, 217
- Venetia, province of Italy, 24
- Via Labicana, church of St. Andrew
on the, 153
- Vicar of Christ, 121
- Victor, Bishop of Vita, 153
- Victor, pope, 23, 41
- Victricius, St., Bishop of Rouen, 150
- Vienne, 36-38, 127
- Visigoths, 34
- Vitalian the Goth, 125, 126
- Vitalis, Bishop of Ravenna, 217
- Xerxes, Persian king, 174
- Xystus (Sixtus) III, St., pope, 46
- Zachary, Bishop of Agnani, 253
- Zachary, Catholicos of Armenia, 239,
241, 243, 270, 271
- Zanzibar, 204
- Zechoi, 257
- Zeno, emperor, 106-08, 110
- Zeugitana Proconsularis, 30
- Zeuxippus, legendary tyrant of By-
zantium, 172, 218, 219, 226, 257
- Zonaras, Greek canonist, 289
- Zosimus I, pope, 37, 46, 47
- Zygi, tribe on shore of Sea of Pontus,
201